THE

VISHŃU PURÁŃA:

A SYSTEM

OF

HINDU MYTHOLOGY AND TRADITION.

TRANSLATED

FROM THE ORIGINAL SANSKRIT,

AND

ILLUSTRATED BY NOTES

DERIVED CHIEFLY FROM OTHER PURÁŃAS,

BY THE LATE

H. H. WILSON, M.A., F.R.S.,

BODEN PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
ETC., ETC.

EDITED BY

FITZEDWARD HALL.

VOL. V.
FIRST PART.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1870.

The Second Part containing the Index will complete the Vishńu Puráńa.

VISHŃU PURÁŃA.

BOOK V. (continued).

CHAPTER XVII.

Akrúra's meditations on Kŕishńa: his arrival at Gokula: his delight at seeing Kŕishńa and his brother.

AKRÚRA, having set off in his quick travelling-car, proceeded to visit Kŕishńa at the pastures* of Nanda; and, as he went along, he congratulated himself on his superior good fortune, in having an opportunity of beholding a descended portion of the deity.† "Now," thought he, "has my life borne fruit; my night is followed by the dawn of day: since I shall see the countenance of Vishńu, whose eyes are like the expanded leaf of the lotos.‡ I shall behold that lotos-eyed aspect§ of Vishńu, which, when seen only in imagination, takes away the sins of men. I shall, to-day, behold that glory of glories,||, the mouth of Vishńu,¶ whence proceeded

---

* *Gokula.* † Namely, Chakrin, in the original.

‡ Here follows, in the Sanskrit, a stanza left untranslated:

अद्य मे सफले नेत्रे अद्य मे सफला गिरः ।
यन्मे परस्परालापो दृष्ट्वा विष्णुं भविष्यति ॥

Śrídhara gives this stanza; but Ratnagarbha does not appear, from my MSS. of his commentary, to recognize it.

§ Literally, "the lotos-eye."

|| धाम धाम्नाम् । Variant, preferred by the commentator Ratnagarbha: धाम देवानां, "light of the gods".

¶ The original has Bhagavat.

the Vedas and all their dependent sciences.* I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained;† who is worshipped as the best of males,‡ as the male of sacrifice§ in sacrificial rites. I shall see Keśava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aświns, the Vasus, Ádityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,[1]

---

[1] The commentator|| explains this to mean Hayagríva,—or Vishńu with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book ¶ of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great

---

* To render *vedánga.*

† *Akhiládhára.*

‡ *Purushottama.* See Vol. I., p. 16, note ‡.

§ *Yajna-purusha.* See Vol. I., p. 163, note *.

|| The words of the commentators are, in common, simply अश्वः । हयग्रीवः । But I show, presently, that they must be wrong

¶ The passage referred to is Chapter VII., 11, where Brahmá is the speaker. The original and Burnouf's translation are subjoined:

सत्त्रे ममास भगवान्हयशीर्षाथो
साक्षात्स यज्ञपुरुषस्तपनीयवर्णः ।
छन्दोमयो मखमयोऽखिलदेवतात्मा
वाचो बभूवुरुशतीः श्वसतोऽस्य नस्तः ॥

"Dans mon sacrifice, Bhagavat lui-même fut Hayaçîrcha, le mâle du sacrifice, dont la couleur est celle de l'or, dont les Vêdas et les sacrifices sont la substance, et les divinités l'âme; quand il respira, de ses narines sortirent de ravissantes paroles."

Professor Wilson's view of the meaning of the stanza just quoted is more than usually imaginative.

a lion,* will, this day, speak to me. Now, the lord of the earth, who assumes shapes at will, has taken upon him the condition of humanity, to accomplish some object cherished in his heart. That Ananta, who holds

---

sacrifice performed by Brahmá, and breathed from his nostrils the texts of the Vedas. The fourth Avatára is always, elsewhere, said to be the Vámana, or dwarf.†

In the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, VIII., XXIV., 7, 8, it is said, that, as Brahmá slumbered, the Vedas slipped out of his mouth, and Hayagríva came, and furtively carried them off. Hari, or Vishńu, it is subsequently stated, at last slew Hayagríva.

According to Vol. II., p. 125, Vishńu is worshipped, in Bhadráśwa, as Hayaśiras,—the Hayaśírsha of the verses cited above, and of the *Bhagavata-puráńa*, V., XVIII., 1. For Aśwaśiras, as an epithet of Náráyańa, or Vishńu, see the *Mahábhárata*, *Śánti-parvan*, *śl.* 13100, &c.

With this divinity Professor Wilson has confounded the demon Hayagríva, for whom see Vol. II., p. 70, note §, and p. 210, note 1. Aśwagríva, mentioned in the *Mahábhárata*, *Ádi-parvan*, *śl* 2533, is, presumably, identical with the latter, who has a fellow in Aśwaśiras,—*ibid.*, *śl.* 2531 and 2646.

The passage in Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXXVI., where "Vishńu, as Hayagríva" is spoken of, I have not yet been able to verify. In the meantime, it may pretty safely be surmised that there is a mistake.

Hayaśírsha, Hayaśiras, and Aśwaśiras are, being interpreted, 'Horse-headed'; Hayagríva and Aśwagríva, 'Horse-necked.'

In the *Śabdakalpadruma*, the first definition of Hayagríva makes him an epiphany of Vishńu, for the sake of recovering the Vedas, which had been carried off by Madhu and Kaiťabha. The passage there quoted—*Mahábhárata*, *Śánti-parvan*, *śl.* 13497—13503,—does not, however, mention Hayagríva at all, but Aśwaśiras.

My friend Mr. C. P. Brown informs me, that, in the Madras Presidency, Hayagríva is a not uncommon name for a Bráhman to bear. The fact is noteworthy. Hayagrívahan, "Slayer of Hayagríva," is an epithetical designation of Hayaśírsha, *i. e.*, Vishńu.

* *Siṁha*; which here denotes *nri-siṁha*, the commentators say. See Vol IV., p. 277, text and note ‡.

† See Vol. III., p. 18, text and note 1.

the earth upon his crest, and who has descended upon earth for its protection, will (this day,) call me by my name. Glory to that being, whose deceptive adoption of father, son, friend, brother, mother, and relative the world is unable to penetrate! Glory to him, who is one with true knowledge, who is inscrutable,* and through whom, seated in his heart, the Yogin crosses the wide expanse of worldly ignorance and illusion! I bow to him, who, by the performers of holy rites, is called the male of sacrifice (Yajnapurusha); by pious worshippers† is termed Vásudeva; and, by the cultivators of philosophy,‡ Vishńu. May he in whom cause, and effect, and the world itself is comprehended be propitious to me, through his truth; for always do I put my trust in that unborn, eternal Hari, by meditation on whom man becomes the repository of all good things."§

His mind thus animated by devout faith, and meditating in this manner, Akrúra (proceeded on his road, and) arrived at Gokula a little before sunset, at the time of the milking of the cows.|| And there he saw Kŕishńa, amongst the cattle, dark as the leaf of the

---

* *Ameya.*

† *Sátwata.*

‡ *Vedánta.*

§ यथा तत्र जगद्धाम्नि धातर्य्यै तत्प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
सदसत्तेन सत्येन मय्यसौ यातु सौम्यताम् ॥
स्मृते सकलकल्याणभाजनं यत्र जायते ।
पुरुषस्तमजं नित्यं व्रजामि शरणं हरिम् ॥

|| The original here has "at the milking-place of tbe cows", आदोहने गवाम् । Śrídhara's and Ratnagarbha's comment: आदोहने। दोहनस्थाने।

full-blown lotos; his eyes of the same colour,* and his breast decorated with the Śrívatsa† mark; long-armed, and broad-chested; having a high nose,‡ and a lovely countenance brightened with mirthful smiles; treading firmly on the ground, with feet whose nails were tinted red; clad in yellow garments, and adorned with a garland of forest-flowers;§ having a fresh-gathered creeper in his hand,|| and a chaplet of white lotos-flowers on his head.¶ Akrúra** also beheld, there, Balabhadra, white as a swan, a jasmine, or the moon, and dressed in blue raiment; having large and powerful arms,†† and a countenance as radiant as a lotos in bloom,—like another Kailása-mountain, crested with a wreath of clouds.

When Akrúra saw these two youths, his countenance expanded with delight,‡‡ and the down of his body stood erect (with pleasure). For this he thought to be supreme happiness and glory; this, the double manifestation of the divine Vásudeva.§§ This was the twofold gratification of his sight, to behold the creator

---

* प्रस्पष्टपद्मपत्राक्षम् ।

† See Vol. IV., p. 268.

‡ प्रलम्बबाहुमासीनं तुङ्गोरस्थलमुन्नसम् ।

§ वन्यपुष्पविभूषितम् ।

|| सार्द्रनीललताहस्तम् । Variant, accepted by the commentator Ratnagarbha: सेन्द्रनीलाचलाभं तम् ।

¶ सिताम्भोजावतंसकम् ।

** *Yadu-nandana*, "descendant of Yadu," in the or·ginal.

†† Add "and shoulders".

‡‡ विकसद्वक्त्रसरोजः ।

§§ एतत्तत्परमं धाम तदेतत्परमं पदम् ।
भगवद्वासुदेवांशो द्विधा योऽयमवस्थितः ॥

of the universe: now he hoped that his bodily form would yield fruit,—as it would bring him in contact with the person of Kŕishńa,*—and that the wearer of infinite forms would place his hand on his back; the touch of whose finger alone is sufficient to dispel sin, and to secure imperishable felicity; that hand which launches the fierce irresistible discus, blazing with all the flames of fire, lightning, and the sun, and, slaughtering the demon-host, washes the collyrium from the eyes of their brides; that hand into which Bali poured water, and thence obtained ineffable enjoyments below the earth,† and immortality, and dominion over the gods for a whole Manwantara, without peril from a foe. "Alas! He will despise me for my connexion with Kaḿsa,—an associate with evil, though not contaminated by it. How vain is his birth, who is shunned by the virtuous!‡ And yet, what is there,

---

* साफल्यमक्ष्णोर्युगमेतदत्र
दृष्टे जगद्धातरि यातमुच्चैः ।
अप्यङ्गमेतद्भगवत्प्रसादा-
द्दत्तेऽङ्गसङ्गे फलवन्मम स्यात् ॥

† The original implies that Bali, who had dwelt below the earth, obtained, &c.:

* * * * * बलिर्मनोज्ञा-
नवाप भोगान्वसुधातलस्थः ।

For Bali,—a Daitya, son of Virochana,—successively sovereign of Pátála and an Indra, see Vol. II., p. 69, and p. 210, note 1; Vol. III., p. 18, note 1, and p. 23.

The translation, towards the end of the present chapter, is very free, generally.

‡ अप्येष मां कंसपरिग्रहेण
दोषास्पदीभूतमदोषदुष्टम् ।
कर्ता न मानोपहतं धिगस्तु
तज्जन्म तत्साधु बहिष्कृतो यः ॥

in this world, unknown to him who resides in the hearts of all men, who is ever existent, exempt from imperfection, the aggregate of the quality of purity, and identical with true knowledge?* With a heart wholly devoted to him, then, I will approach the lord of all lords, the descended portion of Purushottama, of Vishńu, who is without beginning, middle, or end."

Some of my MSS. have, instead of न मौनोपहतं, अवमानोपहतम्। This variant is noted by the commentator Ratnagarbha, and appears in the text of Śrídhara.

* ज्ञानात्मकस्यामलसत्त्वराशे-
रपेतदोषस्य सदा स्फुटस्य।
किं वा जगत्यत्र समस्तपुंसा-
मज्ञातमस्यास्ति हृदि स्थितस्य॥

CHAPTER XVIII.

Grief of the Gopís, on the departure of Kŕishńa and Balaráma with Akrúra: their leaving Gokula. Akrúra bathes in the Yamuná; beholds the divine forms of the two youths, and praises Vishńu.

THUS meditating, the Yádava approached Govinda, (and addressed him,) and said "I am Akrúra," and bowed his head down to the feet of Hari.* But Kŕishńa laid upon him his hand, which was marked with the flag, the thunderbolt, and the lotos, and drew him (towards him), and affectionately embraced him. Then Ráma† and Keśava entered into conversation with him, and, having heard from him all that had occurred, were much pleased, and led him to their habitation: there they resumed their discourse, and gave him food to eat, and treated him with proper hospitality.‡ Akrúra told them how (their father) Ánakadundubhi,§ the princess Devakí, and (even his own father,) Ugrasena had been insulted by the iniquitous demon,|| Kaḿsa: he also related to them the purpose for which he had been despatched. When he had told them all these things, the destroyer of Keśin¶ said to him: "I

---

* चरणौ ननाम शिरसा हरेः ।

† The original has Bala.

‡ सह ताभ्यां तदाक्रूरः कृतसंवादनादिकः ।
भुक्तभोज्यो यथान्यायमाचचक्षे ततस्तयोः ॥

§ See Vol. IV., p. 101, text and note 1.

|| *Dánava.*

¶ *Keśi-súdana.* Compare the cognate epithet of Kŕishńa, Madhusúdana, "slayer of Madhu."

was aware of all that you have told me, lord of liberal gifts.* Ráma and I will go, to-morrow, to Mathurá, along with you. The elders of the cowherds shall accompany us, bearing ample offeriugs.† Rest here to-night, and dismiss all anxiety.‡ Within three nights I will slay Kaṁsa and his adherents."

Having given orders, accordingly, to the cowherds, Akrúra, with Keśava and Ráma, § retired to rest, and slept soundly in the dwelling of Nanda. The next morning was bright; and the youths prepared to depart for Mathurá, with Akrúra. The Gopís, seeing them about to set forth, were much afflicted; they wept bitterly; their bracelets were loose upon their arms; and they thus communed together:|| "If Govinda depart for Mathurá, how will he return to Gokula? His ears will there be regaled with the melodious and polished conversation of the women of the city. Accustomed to the language of the graceful females of Mathurá, he will never again endure the rustic expressions of the Gopís. Hari, the pride of the station,¶ is carried off; and a fatal blow is inflicted upon us by inexorable destiny. Expressive smiles, soft language, graceful airs, elegant gait, and significant

---

* Here follows a stanza left untranslated:

करिष्ये च महाभाग यद्त्रौपयिकं मतम् ।
विचिन्त्यं नान्यथैतत्ते विद्धि कंसं हतं मया ॥

These verses are recognized, in their texts and comments, by both the scholiasts. Furthermore, they are found translated at length in Professor Wilson's Hindu-made English version.

† *Upáyana.*

‡ निश्शेयं नीयतां वीर न चिन्तां कर्तुमर्हसि ।

§ Balabhadra, in the Sanskrit.

|| The translation is, hereabouts, free and expanded.

¶ *Goshṫha.*

glances belong to the women of the city.* Hari is of rustic breeding; and, captivated by their fascinations, what likelihood is there of his returning to the society of any one amongst us?† Keśava, who has mounted the car, to go to Mathurá, has been deceived by the cruel, (vile), and desperate Akrúra. Does not the unfeeling traitor know the affection that we all here feel for our Hari, the joy of our eyes, that he is taking him away? Unkind that he is, Govinda is departing from us, along with Ráma. Haste! Let us stop him. Why talk of telling our seniors that we cannot bear his loss? What can they do for us, when we are consumed by the fires of separation? The Gopas, with Nanda at their head, are, themselves, preparing to depart. No one makes any attempt to detain Govinda. Bright is the morning that succeeds to this night, for the women of Mathurá; for the bees of their eyes will feed upon the lotos-face of Achyuta. Happy are they who may go hence without impediment, and behold, enraptured, Kŕishńa on his journey. A great festival will give pleasure, to-day, to the eyes of the inhabitants of Mathurá, when they see the person of Govinda.‡ What a blissful vision will be seen by the happy women (of the city), whose brilliant eyes shall regard, unchecked,

---

* भावगर्भस्मितं वाक्यं विलासललिता गतिः ।
नागरीणामथैवैतत्कटाक्षेक्षितमेव च ॥

† ग्राम्यो हरिरयं तासां विलासनिगडैर्युतः ।
भवतीनां पुनः पार्श्वं कया युक्त्या समेष्यति ॥

‡ धन्यास्ति पथि ये कृष्णमितो यान्त्यनिवारिताः ।
उद्वहिष्यन्ति पश्यन्तः स्वदेहं पुलकाञ्चितम् ॥
मथुरानगरीपौरनयनानां महोत्सवः ।
गोविन्दावयवैर्दृष्टैरतीवाद्य भविष्यति ॥

the countenance of Kríshńa!* Alas! The eyes of the Gopís have been deprived of sight by the relentless Brahmá,† after he had shown them this great treasure. In proportion as the affection of Hari for us decays, so do our limbs wither, and the bracelets slip from our arms.‡ And now the cruel Akrúra urges on the horses. All conspire to treat unhappy females with unkindness. Alas! alas! We see, now, only the dust of his chariot-wheels. And now he is far away; for even that dust is no longer to be seen." Thus lamented by the women,§ Keśava and Ráma quitted the district of Vraja.[1] Travelling in a car drawn by fleet horses, they arrived, at noon, at the banks of the Yamuná, when Akrúra requested them to halt a little, whilst he performed the usual daily ceremonial in the

---

[1] In the Bhágavata, Hari Vaḿśa, &c., several adventures of Kríshńa, during his residence at Vraja, are recorded, of which our text makes no mention. Of these, the two most popular are Kríshńa's taking away the clothes of the Gopís whilst bathing, and his liberating the Gopas from the mouth of Aghásura,||—disguised as a vast serpent,—into which they had entered, thinking it a cavern in a mountain. The omission of these two legends, or of any of the rest, is not much to be regretted.

---

* The original has Adhokshaja, for the signification of which word see Vol. I., p. 28, note †

† Vidhátri, in the Sanskrit. *Vide infra*, p. 15, note ¶.

‡ अनुरागेण शैथिल्यमस्मासु व्रजता हरेः ।
शैथिल्यमुपयान्त्याशु करेषु वलयान्यपि ॥

§ इत्येवमतिहार्देन गोपीजननिरीक्षितः ।

|| That is to say, Agha the Asura. He was Kaṁsa's generalissimo; and it seems that little more than this fact is known of him. See the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, X., Prior Section, Chapter XII.

river.[1]* Accordingly, the intelligent Akrúra bathed, and rinsed his mouth; and then, entering the stream, he stood meditating upon the supreme being.† But he beheld (mentally,[2]) Balabhadra, having a thousand hooded heads, a garland of jasmine-flowers, and large red eyes,‡ attended by Vásuki,§ Rambha,|| and other mighty serpents,¶ praised by the Gandharvas, decorated with wild flowers, wearing dark-coloured garments, crowned with a chaplet** of lotoses, ornamented with brilliant ear-rings, inebriate, and standing at the bottom of the river, in the water.[3] On his lap he also

---

[1] The noonday prayer, or Sandhyá.

[2] By his Dhyána, or force of meditation, in which it is attempted to bring before the mind's eye some definite form of the object of adoration. In this case, Akrúra is compelled to see a form he did not anticipate. The Hari Vaḿśa,†† very clumsily, sets him to meditate upon the serpent Śesha, which spoils the story; intended, as that is, to exhibit the identity of Balaráma and Kŕishńa with the Supreme.

[3] Balaráma was, thus, visible in his real character of Śesha,‡‡— the chief of serpents, the couch of Vishńu, and supporter of the world.

---

* अथाह कृष्णमक्रूरो भवद्भ्यां तावदास्यताम् ।
यावत्करोमि कालिन्द्यामाह्निकार्हणमम्भसि ॥

The Yamuná is here called Kálindí.

† To translate Brahma.

‡ उन्निद्रपद्मपत्रारुणेक्षणम् ।

§ See Vol. II., p. 74.

|| See Vol. II., p. 287, note *. The conjecture which I there ventured thus turns out to be correct.

¶ *Pavanáśin.*

** *Avataḿsaka.*

†† Chapter XCIII.

‡‡ See Vol. II., pp. 74 and 85, and p. 211, note 1; also, Vol. III., pp. 30, 31.

beheld, at his ease,* Kŕishńa, of the complexion of a cloud,[1] with full and coppery eyes, having an elegant form, and four hands, armed with the discus and other weapons, wearing yellow clothes, decorated with many-coloured flowers, and appearing like a cloud embellished with streams of lightning and the bow of Indra.† His breast was marked with the celestial sign;‡ his arms were radiant with bracelets; a diadem shone on his brow;§ and he wore a white lotos for his crest.‖ He was attended by Sanandana¶ and other holy sages, who, fixing their eyes upon the tips of their noses, were absorbed in profound meditation.**

When Akrúra beheld Balaráma†† and Kŕishńa in this situation, he was much amazed, and wondered how they could so quickly have got there from the chariot. He wished to ask them this; but Janárdana deprived him of the faculty of speech, at the moment. Ascending, then, from the water, he repaired to the car; and there he found them both, (quietly) seated, in the same human persons as before. Plunging, again, into the water, there he again beheld them, hymned, as before,

[1] Or, rather, he beheld Ghanaśyáma,—an appellation of Kŕishńa, who is so called from being as black (śyáma) as a cloud (ghana).

* *Aklishťa.*

† Śakra, in the original.

‡ To render *śrívatsa*. *Vide supra*, p. 5.

§ श्रीवत्सवक्षसं चारुकेयूरमुकुटोज्ज्वलम् ।

‖ *Avataṁsaka.*

¶ See Vol. II., p. 226; and p. 227, note 1.

** सनन्दनाद्यैर्मुनिभिः सिद्धयोगैरकल्मषैः ।
विचिन्त्यमानं तत्रस्थैर्नासाग्रन्यस्तलोचनैः ॥

†† The Sanskrit has Bala.

by the Gandharvas, saints,* sages,† and serpents. Apprehending, therefore, their real character, he thus eulogized the eternal deity, who consists of true knowledge:‡

"Salutation to thee, who art uniform and manifold, all-pervading, supreme spirit, of inconceivable glory, and who art simple existence!§ Salutation to thee, O inscrutable, who art truth, and the essence of oblations!|| Salutation to thee, O lord, whose nature is unknown, who art beyond primeval matter, who existest in five forms,¶ as one with the elements, with the faculties,** with matter, with the living soul, with supreme spirit!†† Show favour (to me), O soul of the universe, essence of all things, perishable or eternal, whether addressed by the designation of Brahmá, Vishńu, Śiva, or the like. I adore thee, O god,‡‡ whose nature is indescribable, whose purposes are inscrutable, whose name, even, is unknown;§§ for the at-

---

* *Muni.*

† *Siddha.*

‡ तुष्टाव सर्वविज्ञानमयमच्युतमीश्वरम् ।

§ अक्रूर उवाच ।
सन्मात्ररूपिणेऽचिन्त्यमहिम्ने परमात्मने ।
व्यापिने नैकरूपैकस्वरूपाय नमो नमः ॥

|| *Havis.*

¶ See Vol. I., p. 2, note 1, where this passage is referred to and enlarged on.

** *Indriya.*

†† *Átman* and *paramátman.* The first is the same as *jivátman.* See Vol. IV., p. 253, note *.

‡‡ *Parameśwara.*

§§ अनाख्येयाभिधान । *Abhidhána* here takes the place of the more ordinary *náman,* the term rendered "appellation", just below. See Vol. IV., p. 346, supplement to p. 267, note *.

tributes of appellation or kind* are not applicable to to thee, who art THAT,[1] the supreme Brahma, eternal, unchangeable, uncreated.† But, as the accomplishment of our objects cannot be attained except through some specific form,‡ thou art termed, by us, Kŕishńa, Achyuta, Ananta, or Vishńu.§ Thou, unborn (divinity), art all the objects of these impersonations; thou art the gods, and all other beings; thou art the whole world; thou art all. Soul of the universe, thou art exempt from change; and there is nothing except thee in all this existence. Thou art Brahmá, Paśupati, Aryaman,|| Dhátŕi, and Vidhátŕi;¶ thou art Indra,** air, fire, the regent of the waters,†† the god of wealth,‡‡ and judge of the dead;§§ and thou, although but one, presidest over the world, with various energies addressed to various purposes. Thou, identical with the solar ray, createst the universe; all elementary substance is

---

[1] Tad, 'that'; all that is, or that can be conceived.

---

* It should seem, from a collation of passages, that *játi*, the expression here used, is synonymous with *rúpa*. Do *náman* and *játi* signify 'genus' and 'species'? See Vol. II., p. 328, text and note ‡; and p. 337, supplementary note to p. 59, l. 8.

† *Aja.*

‡ कल्पनामृते ।

§ ततः कृष्णाच्युतानन्तविष्णुसंज्ञाभिरीड्यसे ।

|| Corrected from "Áryaman".

¶ Dhátŕi and Vidhátŕi are said to be Brahmá as protector and creator. See Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., p. 191. In lieu of Dhátŕi, some MSS. yield Vishńu.

** To represent *tridaśapati*, 'lord of the gods.'

†† *Toyeśa*; Varuńa, to-wit.

‡‡ *Dhana-pati*; namely, Kubera.

§§ The original yields Antaka, who is one with Yama. See Vol. II., p. 216, note 1.

composed of thy qualities; and thy supreme form is denoted by the imperishable term SAT (existence). To him who is one with true knowledge; who is, and is not, perceptible,* I bow. Glory be to him, the lord Vásudeva, to Sankarshańa, to Pradyumna, and to Aniruddha!"[1]

---

[1] Akrúra's piety is, here, prophetic: the son and grandson of Křishńa (see Vol. IV., p. 112,) are not yet born. But this is the Vaishńava style of addressing Křishńa, or Vishńu, as identical with four Vyúhas,—'arrangements' or 'dispositions',—Křishńa, Balaráma, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha.† See the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 35.‡ In this, as in several other places, the Vishńu Puráńa differs from some of the other narratives of Křishńa, by the length and character of the prayers addressed to Vishńu. The Hari Vaḿśa, for instance, here has no prayer or panegyric at all; the Bhágavata inserts one.

---

* *Sat* and *asat*, 'real' and 'unreal'.

† Ratnagarbha, one of the commentators on the *Vishńu-puráńa*, refers, to a similar purport, to the *Mahábhárata.* The passage intended is, apparently, in the *Śánti-parvan,—śl.* 12888, *et seq.*

‡ Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., p. 45.

CHAPTER XIX.

Akrúra conveys Kŕishńa and Ráma near to Mathurá, and leaves them: they enter the town. Insolence of Kaḿsa's washerman: Kŕishńa kills him. Civility of a flower-seller: Kŕishńa gives him his benediction.

THUS, the Yádava (Akrúra), standing in the river, praised Kŕishńa, and worshipped him with imaginary* incense and flowers. Disregarding (all) other objects, he fixed his (whole) mind upon the deity; and, having continued, for a long time, in spiritual contemplation,† he (at last,) desisted from his abstraction, conceiving he had effected the purposes of soul.‡ Coming up from the water of the Yamuná, he went to the car; and there he beheld Ráma and Kŕishńa, seated as before. As his looks denoted surprise, Kŕishńa said to him: "Surely, Akrúra, you have seen some marvel in the stream of the Yamuná; for your eyes are staring, as if with astonishment." Akrúra replied: "The marvel that I have seen in the stream of the Yamuna I behold before me, even here, in a bodily shape; for he whom I have encountered in the water, Kŕishńa, is, also, your wondrous self, of whose illustrious person the whole world is the miraculous development.§ But

---

* *Mano-maya.*

† *Brahma-bhúta.*

‡ कृतकृत्यमिवात्मानं मन्यमानो महामतिः ।

This is in the same stanza with what immediately follows, and should have been connected with it, in the translation.

§ जगदेतन्महाश्चर्यं रूपं यस्य महात्मनः ।
तेनाश्चर्यवरेणाहं भवता कृष्ण संगतः ॥

enough of this. Let us proceed to Mathurá. I am afraid Kaḿsa will be angry at our delay: such is the wretched consequence of eating the bread of another."* Thus speaking, he urged on the quick† horses; and they arrived, after sunset, at Mathurá. When they came in sight of the city, Akrúra said to Kŕishńa and Ráma: "You must now journey on foot, whilst I proceed alone in the car.‡ And you must not go to the house of Vasudeva; for the elder has been banished, by Kaḿsa, on your account."

Akrúra, having thus spoken, left them, and entered the city; whilst Ráma and Kŕishńa continued to walk along the royal road. Regarded, with pleasure, by men and women, they went along sportively, looking like two young elephants. As they roamed about, they saw a washerman§ colouring clothes; and, with smiling countenances, they went and threw down some of his fine linen.|| The washerman was the servant of Kaḿsa, made insolent by his master's favour;¶ and he provoked the two lads with loud and

---

* तत्किमेतेन मथुरां व्रजामो मधुसूदन ।
विभेमि कंसाद्धिग्जन्म परपिण्डोपजीविनाम् ॥

† *Váta-raḿhas.*

‡ यज्ञां यातं महावीर्यौ रथेनैको विशाम्यहम् ।

§ *Rajaka.* From the context the word seems to denote a dyer.

|| अयाचेतां सुरूपाणि वासांसि रुचिराननौ ।

The lads did not "throw down some of his fine linen", but asked him for it.

रुचिराणि तौ is the reading preferred by the commentator Ratnagarbha; रुचिराननौ, that accepted by Śrídhara: and neither of them mentions that of the other.

¶ कंसस्य रजकः सोऽथ प्रसादारूढविस्मयः ।

Instead of प्रसादा°, some MSS. have प्रमादा°.

scurrilous abuse, until Kŕishńa struck him down, with his head to the ground, and killed him. Then, taking the clothes, they went their way, clad in yellow and blue raiment, until they came to a flower-seller's shop. The flower-seller looked at them with astonishment, and wondered who they could be, or whence they could have come. Seeing two youths so lovely, dressed in yellow and blue garments, he imagined them to be divinities descended upon earth. Being addressed by them with mouths budding like lotoses, and asked for some flowers, he placed his hands upon the ground, and touched it with his head, saying: "My lords have shown me great kindness, in coming to my house,*— fortunate that I am. I will pay them homage." Having thus spoken, the flower-seller, with a smiling aspect, gave them whatever choice flowers they selected, to conciliate their favour. Repeatedly prostrating† himself before them, he presented them with flowers, beautiful, fragrant, and fresh.‡ Kŕishńa, then, being much pleased with him, gave him this blessing: "Fortune, good friend, who depends upon me, shall never forsake you. Never shall you suffer loss of vigour or loss of wealth. As long as time shall last, your descendants shall not fail.§ Having long tasted various de-

---

* प्रसादपरमौ नाथौ मम गेहमुपागतौ ।

† प्रणम्य, which implies nothing more than a respectful inclination of the head and uplifting of the hands.

‡ *Amala.*

§ यावद्दिनानि तावच्च न नशिष्यति संततिः ।

This lection, Ratnagarbha's, is the one followed by the Translator. Śrídhara's and that of nearly all my best MSS. begins the verse with the words यावत्त्वन्नाम ।

lights (on earth), you shall, finally, obtain, by calling me to recollection, a heavenly region, the consequence of my favour. Your heart shall ever be intent on righteousness; and fulness of days shall be the portion of your posterity. Your descendants shall not be subject to natural infirmities, as long as the sun shall endure."* Having thus spoken, Kŕishńa and Ráma,† worshipped by the flower-seller, went forth from his dwelling.[1]

[1] These incidents are told, with some unimportant differences, in the other accounts of Kŕishńa's youth.

* नोपसर्गादिकं दोषं युष्मत्संततिसंभवः ।
संप्राप्स्यति महाभाग यावत्सूर्यो धरिष्यति ॥

† Baladeva, in the original.

CHAPTER XX.

Kṛishṅa and Balaráma meet Kubjá; she is made straight by the former: they proceed to the palace. Kṛishṅa breaks a bow intended for a trial of arms. Kaṁsa's orders to his servants. Public games. Kṛishṅa and his brother enter the arena: the former wrestles with Cháṅúra, the latter, with Mushṫika, the king's wrestlers, who are, both, killed. Kṛishṅa attacks and slays Kaṁsa: he and Balaráma do homage to Vasudeva and Devakí: the former praises Kṛishṅa.

AS they proceeded along the high road, they saw coming (towards them) a young girl, who was crooked, carrying a pot of unguent. Kṛishṅa addressed her sportively, and said: "For whom are you carrying that unguent? Tell me, lovely maiden;* tell me truly." Spoken to as it were through affection, Kubjá,† well disposed towards Hari, replied to him also mirthfully, being smitten by his appearance: "Know you not, beloved, that I am the servant of Kaṁsa, and appointed, crooked as I am, to prepare his perfumes?‡ Unguent ground by any other he does not approve of: hence I am enriched through his liberal rewards." Then said Kṛishṅa: "Fair-faced damsel, give us of this unguent,—

---

* *Indivara-lochaná.*

† No proper name, here and near the top of the next page, but "the deformed girl". The word *kubjá* is rendered "crooked", above.

‡ कान्त कस्मान्न जानासि कंसेनाभिनियोजिताम् ।
नैकवक्रेति विख्यातामनुलेपनकर्मणि ॥

The name of the damsel, we are thus told, was Naikavakrá. In the *Bhágavata-puráṅa*, X., Prior Section, XLII., 3, her name appears as Trivakrá. She was so called, the commentator Śrídhara remarks, because triply deformed,—namely, in the neck, in the chest, and in the waist.

fragrant, and fit for kings,—as much as we may rub upon our bodies." "Take it," answered Kubjá. And she gave them as much of the unguent as was sufficient for their persons. And they rubbed it on various parts of their faces and bodies,[1] till they* looked like two clouds, one white and one black, decorated by the many-tinted bow of Indra. Then Kŕishńa,† skilled in the curative art, took hold of her, under the chin, with the thumb and two fingers, and lifted up her head, whilst, with his feet, he pressed down her feet; and, in this way, he made her straight. When she was thus relieved from her deformity, she was a most beautiful woman;‡ and, filled with gratitude and affection, she took Govinda by the garment, and invited him to her house. Promising to come at some other time, Kŕishńa § smilingly dismissed her, and then

---

[1] They had their bodies smeared in the style called Bhaktichchheda (भक्तिच्छेदानुलिप्ताङ्गौ); that is, with the separating or distinguishing (chheda) marks of Vaishńava devotion (bhakti),—certain streaks on the forehead, nose, cheeks, breast, and arms, which denote a follower of Vishńu. See the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 33.||

---

* The original here gives them the epithet *purusharshabha.*

† Śauri, in the Sanskrit. See the original in the next annotation.

‡ ततस्तां चिबुके शौरिरुल्लापनविधानवित् ।
उत्पाद्य तोलयामास द्व्यङ्गुलेनाग्रपाणिना ॥
चकर्ष पद्भ्यां च तथा ऋजुत्वं केशवोऽनयत् ।
ततः सा ऋजुतां प्राप्ता योषितामभवद्वरा ॥

For some of the additions to the literal sense of the original, the Translator has drawn on Śrídhara.

§ The Sanskrit has Hari.

|| Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., p. 41.

laughed aloud, on beholding the countenance of Bala-deva.[1]*

Dressed in blue and yellow garments, and anointed with fragrant unguents,† Keśava and Ráma proceeded to the hall of arms, which was hung round with garlands.‡ Inquiring of the warders which bow he was to try, and being directed to it, he took it, and bent it.§ But, drawing it with violence, he snapped it in two;[2] and all Mathurá resounded with the noise which its fracture occasioned. Abused by the warders for breaking the bow, Kŕishńa and Ráma retorted, and defied them, and left the hall.||

When Kaḿsa knew that Akrúra had returned, and heard that the bow had been broken, he thus said to Cháńúra and Mushťika, (his boxers): "Two youths, cowherd boys, have arrived. You must kill them both, in a trial of strength,¶ in my presence; for they prac-

---

[1] The story is similarly told in the Bhágavata, &c.

[2] The bending or breaking of a bow is a favourite incident in Hindu heroic poetry; borrowed, no doubt, from the Rámáyańa, where, however, it has an object: here it is quite gratuitous.

---

* Ráma, in the original.

† भक्तिच्छेदानुलिप्ताङ्गौ। See note 1 in the preceding page.

‡ According to the original, in all my MSS., &c., the youths, not the hall, were thus adorned.

§ आयोगं च धनूरत्नं ताभ्यां पृष्टैश्च रक्षिभिः।
आख्यातं सहसा कृष्णो गृहीत्वापूरयद्धनुः॥

Instead of आयोगं च, the lection of Śrídhara, Ratnagarbha has आयोगवं, and says that we here have the name of the bow, Áyogava. The commentators mention and explain other readings; and my MSS. supply still more.

|| रक्षिसैन्यं निहत्योभौ निष्क्रान्तौ कार्मुकालयात्।

¶ *Malla-yuddha.* See note ¶ in p. 39, *infra*.

tise against my life. I shall be well pleased if you kill them in the match, and will give you whatever you wish; not else. These two foes of mine must be killed by you, fairly or unfairly. The kingdom shall be ours in common, when they have perished." Having given them these orders, he sent, next, for his elephant-driver, and desired him to station his (great) elephant, Kuvalayápíd́a,—who was as vast as a cloud charged with rain,—near the gate of the arena, and drive him upon the two boys, when they should attempt to enter.* When Kaḿsa had issued these commands, and ascertained that the platforms were all ready (for the spectators), he awaited the rising of the sun, unconscious of impending death.†

In the morning, the citizens assembled on the platforms set apart for them; and the princes, with the ministers and courtiers,‡ occupied the royal seats. Near the centre of the circle, judges of the games§ were stationed by Kaḿsa, whilst he himself sat apart, close by, upon a lofty throne. Separate platforms were erected for the ladies of the palace,|| for the

---

* प्रोवाचोच्चैस्त्वया मल्लसमाजद्वारि कुञ्जरः ।
स्थाप्यः कुवलयापीडस्तेन तौ गोपदारकौ ॥

Instead of मल्ल°, there occurs, as a common variant, the lection accepted by Śrídhara, मेऽद्य । This, mistaken for मेघ°, with the supposition that त्वया was misread तोय°, is the only ground that I have discovered for the Translator's clause "who was as vast as a cloud charged with rain."

† The original has आसन्नमरणः, which only implies that his death was near, not that he knew it to be so.

‡ These two words are to represent *ámátya*. *Bhŕitya*, 'dependants', is a variant.

§ मल्लप्राश्निकवर्गः । Variant: मल्लपार्श्विकवर्गः ।

|| *Antańpura.*

courtesans,* and for the wives of the citizens.[1] Nanda and the cowherds had places appropriated to them, at

[1] The Bhágavata enters into even fewer particulars than our text, of the place set apart for the games. The Hari Vaṁśa gives a much more detailed description, which is, in some respects, curious. The want of any technical glossary, and the general manner in which technical terms are explained in the ordinary dictionaries, render it difficult to understand exactly what is intended; and any translation of the passages must be defective. The French version,† however, probably represents a much more splendid and theatrical scene than the text authorizes, and may, therefore, admit of correction. The general plan is nothing more than an enclosed space, surrounded by temporary structures of timber or bamboos, open or enclosed, and decorated with hangings and garlands. It may be doubted if the details described by the compiler of the Hari Vaṁśa were very familiar even to him; for his description is not always very consistent or precise. Of two commentators, one evidently knows nothing of what he attempts to explain; but, with the assistance of the other, the passages may be thus, though not always confidently, rendered:

"The king, Kaṁśa, meditating on these things, went forth, from his palace, to the place which had been prepared for the sight of the ceremonial (1), to inspect the scaffolds (2) which had been constructed. He found the place close set with the several platforms (3) of the different public bodies (4), strongly put together, and decorated with roofed pavilions of various sizes, supported by columns, and divided into commodious chambers. (5) The edifice was extensive,‡ well arranged, secured by strong rafters, (6) spacious and lofty, and commodious and secure. Stairs led to the different galleries. (7) § Chairs of state (8) were placed in

* *Vára-mukhyá.*

† M. Langlois's translation, Vol. I., pp. 354, 355, and pp. 362—364.

‡ *Swáyata.* Variant: *swáyuta.*

§ The translation of the last two sentences educes much more from the original than even the commentaries warrant.

the end of which sat Akrúra and Vasudeva. Amongst the wives of the citizens appeared Devakí, mourning

---

various parts of it. The avenues that conducted to it were narrow (9). It was covered with temporary stages and sheds, (10) and was capable of sustaining the weight of a multitude.

"Having seen the place of the festival thus adorned, Kaḿsa gave orders, and said: 'To-morrow let the platforms, and terraces, and pavilions (11) be decorated with pictures, and garlands, and flags, and images; (12) and let them be scented with fragrant odours, and covered over with awnings. (13) Let there be ample heaps of dry pounded cow-dung (14) provided on the ground,* and suitable refreshment-chambers be covered over, and decorated with bells and ornamented arches. (15) Let large water-jars be securely fixed in order, capable of holding a copious supply, and provided with golden drinking-cups. Let apartments be prepared (16), and various kinds of beverage, in appropriate vessels, be ready. Let judges of the games be invited, and corporations, with their chiefs. Let orders be issued to the wrestlers, and notice be given to the spectators; and let platforms, for their accommodation, be fitted up in the place of assembly.' " (17) †

---

* *Aksha-váťa* is the reading of my oldest MS., instead of the ordinary *ranga-váťa*.

† *Harivaḿśa, śl.* 4527—4537:

एवं राजा विचिन्त्याथ निष्क्रम्य स्वगृहोत्तमात् ।
प्रेक्षागारं जगामाशु मञ्चानामवलोककः ॥
स दृष्ट्वा सर्वनिर्युक्तं प्रेक्षागारं नृपोत्तमः ।
श्रेणीनां दृढसंयुक्तैर्मञ्चवाटैर्निरन्तरम् ॥
सोत्तमागारयुक्ताभिर्वेडभीभिर्विभूषितम् ।
कुटीभिश्च प्रवृद्धाभिरेकस्तम्भैश्च भूषितम् ॥
सर्वतः सारनिर्व्यूहं स्वायतं सुप्रतिष्ठितम् ।
उदग्राश्लिष्टसुश्लिष्टमञ्चारोहणमुत्तमम् ॥
नृपासनपरिक्षिप्तं संचारपथसंकुलम् ।
छन्नं तद्वेदिकाभिश्च मानवौघभरक्षमम् ॥
स दृष्ट्वा भूषितं रङ्गमाज्ञापयत बुद्धिमान् ।
श्वः सचित्राः समाल्याश्च सपताकास्तथैव च ॥

for her son,* whose lovely face she longed to behold, even in the hour of his destruction. When the musical

---

When the meeting takes place, the site of the games is thus described: "Upon the following day, the amphitheatre([18]) was filled by the citizens, anxious to behold the games. The place of assembly([19]) was supported by octagonal painted pillars,([20]) fitted up with terraces, and doors, and bolts, with windows, circular or crescent; shaped, and accommodated with seats with cushions;([21]) and it shone like the ocean, whilst large clouds hang upon it, with spacious, substantial pavilions,([22]) fitted up for the sight of the combat; open to the front,([23]) but screened with beautiful and fine curtains,([24]) crowned with festoons of flowers, and glistening with radiance, like autumnal clouds. The pavilions† of the different companies and corporations, vast as mountains, were decorated with banners, bearing upon them the implements and emblems of the several crafts.([25]) The chambers of the inhabitants of the inner apartments shone near at hand, bright with gold, and painting, and net-work of gems: they were richly decorated with precious stones, were enclosed below with costly hangings,([26]) and ornamented above with spires and banners, and looked like mountains spreading their wings in the sky;

सुवासिता वपुष्मन्त उपनीतोत्तरच्छदः ।
क्रियन्तां मञ्चवाटाश्च वडभ्यो वीथयस्तथा ॥
अक्षवाटे करीषस्य कल्प्यन्तां राशयोऽव्ययाः ।
घण्टास्तोरणशोभाश्च बलयश्चानुरूपतः ॥
स्थाप्यन्तां सुनिखाताश्च पानकुम्भा यथाक्रमम् ।
उदभारसहाः सर्वे सकाञ्चनघटोत्तराः ॥
बलयश्चोपकल्प्यन्तां कषायाश्चैव कुम्भशः ।
प्राश्निकाश्च निमन्त्र्यन्तां श्रेण्यश्च सपुरोगमाः ॥
आज्ञा च देया मल्लानां प्रेक्षकाणां तथैव च ।
समाजे मञ्चवाटाश्च कल्प्यन्तां सूपकल्पिताः ॥

* पुत्रगृद्धिनी, which means that Devakí loved her son.

† *Mancha*; previously rendered "scaffolds"; "pavilions" being used to represent *vadabhi* or *valabhi*.

instruments sounded, Cháńúra sprang forth, and the people cried "Alas!" and Mushťika slapped his arms

---

while the rays of light reflected from the valuable jewels were blended with the waving of white chowries and the musical tinkling of female ornaments. The separate pavilions of the courtesans were graced by lovely women, attired in the most splendid dresses, (27) and emulated the radiance of the cars of the gods. In the place of assembly there were excellent seats, couches made of gold, and hangings of various colours, intermixed with bunches of flowers; and there were golden vases of water, and handsome places for refreshment, filled with fruits of various kinds, and cooling juices, and sherbets fit for drinking. (28) And there were many other stages and platforms,* constructed of strong timber; and hangings, by hundreds and thousands, were displayed; and, upon the tops of the houses, chambers (29) fitted up with delicate jalousies, through which the women might behold the sports, appeared like swans flying through the air.

"In front stood the pavilion of Kaḿsa, surpassing all the rest in splendour, looking like Mount Meru, in radiance; its sides, its columns, being covered with burnished gold; fastened with coloured cords, and every way worthy the presence of a king." †

---

* These two substantives are to render *mancha*. See note † in the preceding page.

† *Harivámśa*, *śl.* 4642—4656:

तस्मिन्नहनि निर्वृत्ते द्वितीये समुपस्थिते ।
आपूर्यत महारङ्गः पौरैर्युद्धदिदृक्षुभिः ॥
सचित्राष्टास्त्रिचरणः सार्गलद्वारवेदिकः ।
सगवाक्षार्धचन्द्रश्च सतल्पोत्तमभूषितः ॥
प्राङ्मुखैश्चारुनिर्मुक्तैर्माल्यदामावतंसितैः ।
अलंकृतैर्विराजद्भिः शारदैरिव तोयदैः ॥
मञ्चागारैः सुनिर्मुक्तैर्युद्धाय सुविभूषितैः ।
समाजवाटः शुशुभे समेघौघ इवार्णवः ॥
स्वकर्मद्रव्ययुक्ताभिः पताकाभिर्निरन्तरम् ।
श्रेणीनां च गणानां च मञ्चा भान्त्यचलोपमाः ॥

in defiance. Covered with must* and blood from the elephant, whom, when goaded upon them by his

---

In justification of the rendering of the above, an explanation of the technical terms, taken either from dictionaries or from the commentators,† may be subjoined. (1) Kaṁsa went to the Prekshágára (प्रेक्षागार), literally, 'house of seeing;' but it is evident, from its interior being visible to spectators on the tops of the houses,—as subsequently mentioned,—that it was not a

---

अन्तःपुरगतानां च प्रेक्षागाराण्यनेकशः ।
रेजुः काञ्चनचित्राणि रत्नज्वालाकुलानि च ॥
तानि रत्नौघक्लृप्तानि ससानुप्रगृहाणि च ।
रेजुर्जवनिकाक्षेपैः सपक्षा इव खे नगाः ॥
तत्र चामरहासैश्च भूषणानां च शिञ्जितैः ।
मणीनां च वरार्हाणां विचित्रैश्चैरुरर्चिषः ॥
गणिकानां पृथङ्मञ्चाः शुभैरास्तरणाम्बरैः ।
शोभिता वारमुख्याभिर्विमानप्रतिमौजसः ॥
तत्रासनानि मुख्यानि पर्यङ्काश्च हिरण्मयाः ।
प्रकीर्णाश्च कुथाश्चित्राः सपुष्पस्तबकद्रुमाः ॥
सौवर्णाः पानकुम्भाश्च पानभूम्यश्च शोभिताः ।
फलावदंशपूर्णाश्च चाङ्गेर्यः पानयोजिताः ॥
अन्ये च मञ्चा बहवः काष्ठसंचयबन्धनाः ।
रेजुः प्रस्तरणास्तत्र शतशोऽथ सहस्रशः ॥
उत्तरागारिकाश्चान्ये सूक्ष्मजालावलोकिनः ।
स्त्रीणां प्रेक्षागृहा भान्ति राजहंसा इवाम्बरे ॥
प्राङ्मुखश्चारुनिर्युक्तो मेरुशृङ्गसमप्रभः ।
रुक्मपत्रनिभस्तम्भश्चित्रनिर्योगशोभितः ॥
प्रेक्षागारः स कंसस्य प्रचकाशेऽधिकं श्रिया ।
शोभितो माल्यदामैश्च निवासकृतलक्षणः ॥

* This word, a popularized form of the Persian *mast*, مست, is here used to translate *mada*, the ichor which exudes from the temples of a rutting elephant. *Mast* is an adjective, signifying 'proud', 'in rut'.

† Nilakaṅṭha and Arjuna Miśra. To the scantlings of scholia, adduced in the following pages, that are taken from the former, I have annexed his name. The remaining elucidations which Professor Wilson indicates to be commentatorial are derived from the latter.

driver, they had slain, and armed with his tusks. Balabhadra and Janárdana confidently* entered the arena,

---

theatre, or covered edifice. If a building at all, it was merely a sort of stockade. One commentator † calls it "a place made for seeing the sacrifice": धनुर्महप्रेत्तणार्थं क्षतं स्थानम्। (2) Manchánám avalokakaḿ (मञ्चानामवलोककाः). The Mancha is commonly understood to signify a raised platform, with a floor and a roof, ascended by a ladder: see Dictionary. (3) Mancha-váťa (मञ्चवाट). Váťa is either 'site' or 'inclosure,' and is used, here, without much affecting the sense of Mancha. The compound is explained, by the commentators,‡ 'prepared places' (रचितभूमयः), or 'the sites of the platforms' (मञ्चभूमयः). (4) The Śreńis (श्रेणीनां), associations of artificers practising the same art. One of the commentaries understands the term to be here used to denote, not their station, but their labours: "The structure was the work of the artificers" (प्रयतं श्रेणीनाम्). (5) Several words occur, here, of technical import. The passage is:

सोत्तमागारयुक्ताभिर्वलभीभिर्विभूषितम्। §
कुटीभिश्च प्रवृद्धाभिरेकस्तम्भैश्च भूषितम्॥

Valabhi is said, by the commentator, to mean a structure with a pent roof, supported by six columns; Kuťí, a circular one, having seven roofs (something, perhaps, like a Chinese pagoda,) and four columns. The Eka-stambha is a chamber, supported by one column: वलभीभिरूभयतो नमत्पत्त्वद्वयाभिश्छदीभिः षट्स्तम्भाभिः। कुटीभिश्च प्रवृद्धाभिः कोष्ठकैः सप्तच्छदिकैश्चतुस्तम्भैः।|| (6) Sáranirvyúha

---

* गर्वलीलाविलोकितौ।

† Nílakańťha.

‡ The ensuing definitions I find in Arjuna Miśra only.

§ Some MSS. begin this line with उत्तरागार°.

|| What is meant, here, as the first sentence is from Nílakańťha, who therein explains, first, वलभीभिः, and then छदीभिः, which he reads instead of कुटीभिः. The rest of the Sanskrit, giving a definition of the latter term, is, perhaps, altered from the same commentator.

like two lions amidst (a herd of) deer. Exclamations of pity arose from all the spectators, along with ex-

---

(सारनिर्व्यूह).* It is difficult to understand the necessity of rafters in an inclosure in which the platforms and stages seem to have been erected independently of any floor or wall; but the commentary† explains Nirvyúha, "strong brackets, projecting from a house:" सारनिर्व्यूहं दृढं नागदन्ता गृहान्निर्गतदारुरूपाणि यत्र। (7) Áslishťa-suślishťa-mancharohańam. The first epithet is explained, 'not contracted' (असंकुचितम्);‡ the second, 'well constructed' (साधुरचितम्); and, for the 'ascending' (Árohańa), we have सोपानपङ्क्तिर्यत्र 'where was a line of steps' or 'ladders'. There is another reading of the text, however, which may be rendered: "Having steps well secured in their ascent above" (उदक्प्रवणसुश्लिष्टं§ मञ्चारोहणम्). (8) 'Seats for kings' (नृपासनानि||). (9) Such is the literal purport of Sanchára-patha-sankula (संचारपथसंकुल); implying, possibly, the formation of passages by fences on either side. (10) This is doubtful. The phrase is (छन्नं तद्वेदिकाभिः) Chhannaḿ tad-vedikábhiḣ. Chhanna means, literally, 'covered,' and can scarcely be used in the sense of 'overspread' or 'filled with.' Vediká means an elevated floor or terrace, with which a hall or edifice cannot well be 'covered', and, therefore, requires the sense here given to Chhanna. The commentators are silent. (11) The Manchavátas and Valabhis, as above. The other term is Víthi, 'a shop,' 'a stall,' 'a terrace,' 'a road.' (12) Let them be Vapushmantaḣ (वपुष्मन्तः), "having painted or sculptured figures" (चित्रपुरुषादियुक्ताः).¶ The other

---

* I have altered, here and below, "*niryyúha*", and the same form in Sanskrit. सारनिर्युक्तं is a variant.

† Nílakańťha's.

‡ Nílakańťha's explanation of अश्लिष्ट।

§ उदक्प्रवणमश्लिष्टं—the reading of Arjuna Miśra,—and उदयाश्लिष्टसुश्लिष्टं are further variants that I find.

|| See the original, at the foot of p. 26, *supra*.

¶ Nílakańťha.

pressions of astonishment. "This, then," said the people, "is Kŕishńa. This is Balabhadra. This is he

---

commentary renders it merely 'pleasant' or 'agreeable' (स्पृहणीयाः). ([13]) 'Covered above with cloths' (उपनीतोत्तरच्छदः). The use of the awning or Shamiyána is very common in India. ([14]) For the wrestlers to rub over their bodies, to absorb the perspiration (मल्लानां स्वेदापमार्जनार्थम्). ([15]) This is, all, rather questionable. The passage is, most usually:

घण्टास्तोरणशोभाश्च वलयश्चानुरूपतः ।

Vali, or Bali, in one sense, means 'the edge of a thatch,' and may be put for some sort of temporary structure,—a kind of retiring or refreshment-room for the boxers and wrestlers. In some copies, it is read पटास्तरणशोभाः, "beautiful with cloths spread," on which the performers may sit, when disengaged; perhaps, a sort of carpet on the ground. ([16]) The expression is, again, Vali (वलयश्चोपकल्प्यन्ताम्). Another sense of the word is "offering of viands, or of the remains of a sacrifice, to all beings;"* but that cannot be its purport here: nor is it ever used in the sense of viands in general. The verb Kalp or Kḷip also usually implies 'making'. ([17]) Manchaváťa;† 'in the Samája' or 'assembly'. ([18]) Maháranga (महारङ्ग), "the great place of the performance." Ranga is 'acting' or 'representation'; also, the place or site of it. ([19]) All the copies consulted, except one, offer an irregularity of construction, which, although defended by the commentators, is a license scarcely allowable. The epithets of the first verse are, all, in the plural number; they then occur in the singular, to agree with the only substantive in the description, Samájaváťa. According to the commentaries, the plural term Mancháh́ (मञ्चाः) understood is the substantive to the epithets of the first stanza; and Samájaváťa (the singular), to those of the other verses. This awkwardness is, however, avoided by the reading of an old and very good copy, which puts it, all, in the singular;‡ as:

---

* See Vol. III., p. 118, and p. 220, note 1.

† To render "platforms". My oldest MS. has मञ्चशोभाः ।

‡ So do the Calcutta edition of the *Harivaḿśa*, my oldest MS., and, so far as I know them, MSS. generally.

by whom the fierce night-walker Pútaná was slain;* by whom the waggon was overturned, and the two

---

सचित्राष्टास्त्रिचरणः सार्गलद्वारवेदिकः ।
सगवाक्षार्धचन्द्रश्च सतलोत्तमभूषितः ॥

([20]) The expression is Charaṅa; literally, 'foot;' explained, by the commentator,† Stambha, 'post' or 'pillar'. ([21]) The reading of most of the copies is Śayanottama (शयनोत्तम), which may be taken as the sense of Talottama, 'couches or benches with cushions.' ([22]) Manchágáraiḿ (मञ्चागारैः), 'temporary houses.' ([23]) Or, 'fronting to the east' (प्राङ्मुखैः)‡ ([24]) Nirmuktaiḿ (निर्मुक्तैः); explained, by the commentator, § to mean 'fine threads', 'net-work', or 'gauze', through which persons, females especially, may see, without being seen. ([25]) स्वकर्मद्रव्ययुक्ताभिः पताकाभिः । ([26]) "With ridges and projections" (ससानुप्रगृहाणि). The commentator|| explains this: "with flags on the top of them" (उपरिदेशे सपताकानि). ([27]) This appears to be intended for an epithet of the women; although Ástaraṅa is not usually applied to dress:
आस्तरणाम्बरैः शोभिता वारमुख्याभिः । ¶
([28]) फलावदंशपूर्णाश्च चाङ्गेर्यः पानयोजिताः ।
Phala, of course, is 'fruit'. Avadaṁśa is explained, in lexicons, "what is eaten to excite thirst:" one comment** gives it, "what may be sucked," as tamarinds and the like. Chángerí is explained "fluids for drinking, made with sorrel or acid fruits"; that is, sherbets. ([29]) उत्तमागारिकाः or उत्तरागारिकाः is an epithet of the Prekshágára,†† or look-out house of the women (स्त्रीणां प्रेक्षागृहाः), situated on the tops of their houses, according

---

* See Vol. IV., p. 276.

† ?

‡ Nílakańtha.

§ *Idem.*

|| *Idem.*

¶ Parts of two lines. See the original, in p. 29, *supra.*

** Nílakańtha's.

†† The original exhibits the plural, as does the translation which Professor Wilson here annotates.

Arjuna-trees felled.* This is the boy who trampled and danced on the serpent Káliya;† who upheld the mountain Govardhana for seven nights;‡ who killed, as if in play, the iniquitous Arishťa,§ Dhenuka,|| and Keśin.¶ This, whom we see, is Achyuta.** This is he who has been foretold by the wise, skilled in the sense of the Puráńas, as Gopála, who shall exalt the depressed Yádava race. This is a portion of the all-existing,†† all-generating Vishńu, descended upon earth,

---

to the commentators;‡‡ गृहोपरि गृहं यत्तदुत्तमागारं तत्रभवाः * * * प्रेक्षागृहाः; an arrangement very compatible with the form of Indian houses, which have flat roofs, commonly enclosed by a trellis-work or jalousie of masonry.§§ It is observable, that, in the Vishńu Puráńa, and in the Mahábhárata, on various public occasions, the women take their places on the platforms, or in the pavilions, without curtains or screens.

---

* See Vol. IV., pp. 279 and 281.

† *Ibid.*, p. 291.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 315, 316.

§ *Ibid.*, pp. 333, 334.

|| *Ibid.*, pp. 297, 298.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

** Here the original, according to all my MSS., &c., has the following stanza, unrendered by the Translator, as in his Hindu-made version:

अयं चास्य महाबाहुर्बलभद्रोऽग्रजोऽग्रतः ।
प्रयाति लीलया योषिन्मनोनयननन्दनः ॥

Both the commentators recognize these verses; and Ratnagarbha expounds them.

†† *Sarva-bhúta.* Ratnagarbha explains it by *sarvátman.*

‡‡ The words quoted are Nílakańťha's. Arjuna Miśra has something different.

§§ Professor Wilson's translation of the two passages quoted in pp. 25, 26, and pp. 27, 28, *supra*, and his notes on the same, have suggested numerous remarks which I have withheld; the subject of this episodical matter not being one with which the *Vishńu-puráńa* is very intimately connected.

who, will, assuredly, lighten her load." Thus did the citizens describe Ráma and Kŕishńa, as soon as they appeared; whilst the breast of Devakí glowed with maternal affection;* and Vasudeva, forgetting his infirmities, felt himself young (again), on beholding the countenances of his sons as a season of rejoicing. The women of the palace, and the wives of the citizens, wide opened their eyes, and gazed intently upon Kŕishńa.† "Look, friends," said they to their companions; "look at the face of Kŕishńa. His eyes are reddened by his conflict with the elephant; and the drops of perspiration stand upon his cheeks, outvying a full-blown lotos in autumn, studded with glittering dew.‡ Avail yourself, now, of the faculty of vision. Observe his breast,- the seat of splendour, marked with the mystic sign,§—and his arms, menacing destruction to his foes. Do you not notice Balabhadra, dressed in a blue garment,—his countenance as fair as the jasmine, as the moon, as the fibres of the lotos-stem? See how he gently smiles at the gestures of Mushtika and Cháńúra, as they spring up. And now behold Hari advance to encounter Cháńúra. What! Are there no elders, judges of the field?|| How can the delicate form of Hari,—only yet in the dawn of

---

* उरस्तताप देवक्याः स्नेहस्नुतपयोधरम् ।
Here we have an expression of the idea, that, when a woman is deeply moved in her maternal feelings, she experiences a secretion of milk.

† द्रष्टुं न विरराम तम् ।

‡ This sentence is somewhat interpolated, and otherwise freely rendered. *Avaśyáya*, as appears from the context, here means, as the commentators interpret it, 'hoar-frost,' rather than "dew".

§ To render *śrívatsa*. See Vol. IV., p. 268.

|| *Yukta-kárin*.

adolescence,—be regarded as a match for the vast and adamantine bulk of the great demon?* Two youths, of light and elegant persons, are in the arena, to oppose athletic fiends, headed by the cruel Cháńúra.† This is a great sin‡ in the judges of the games, for the umpires to suffer a contest between boys and strong men."

As thus the women of the city conversed (with one another), Hari, having tightened his girdle, danced in the ring, shaking the ground (on which he trod). Balabhadra, also, danced, slapping his arms in defiance. Where the ground was firm, the invincible Kŕishńa contended, foot to foot, with Cháńúra. The practised demon Mushťika was opposed by Balabhadra. Mutually entwining, and pushing, and pulling, and beating each other with fists, arms, and elbows, pressing each other with their knees, interlacing their arms, kicking with their feet, pressing with their whole weight upon one another,[1] fought Hari and Cháńúra. Desperate

---

[1] The terms here used are technical, and refer to the established modes of wrestling amongst Hindu athletæ.§ 1. Saḿnipáta (संनिपात) is described "mutual laying hold of."|| 2. Avadhúta (अवधूत), "letting go of the adversary." 3. Kshepańa (क्षेपण) "pulling to and casting back." 4. Mushťi-nipáta (मुष्टि-

---

* क्क वज्रकठिनाभोगिशरीरोऽयं महासुरः ।

† इमौ सुललितौ रङ्गे वर्तेते नवयौवनौ ।
दैतेयमल्लाश्चाणूरप्रमुखास्त्वतिदारुणाः ॥

‡ *Vyatikrama.*

§ The following definitions are taken from the two commentaries.

|| परस्परं संश्लेषः । Śrídhara. 'Mutual onset', परस्परं संघर्षः । Ratnagarbha.

was the struggle, though without weapons, and one for life and death, to the great gratification of the

---

निपात),* "striking with fists." 5. Kíla-nipátana (कीलनिपातन), "striking with the elbow." 6. Vajra-nipátana (वज्रनिपातन), "striking with the fore-arm." † 7. Jánu-nirgháta (जानुनिर्घात), ‡ "pressing or striking with the knees." 8. Báhu-vighaṭṭana (बाहु-विघट्टन), § "interlacing the arms." 9. Pádoddhúta (पादोद्धूत), "kicking." || 10. Prasṛishṭá ¶ (प्रसृष्टा), "intertwining of the whole body." In some copies,** another term occurs, Aśma-nirgháta (अश्मनिर्घात), "striking with stones," or "striking blows as hard as with stones;" for stones could scarcely be used in a

---

* The original has no such term, but मुष्टिभिः, "with the fists."

† *Aratni-dwaya.* *Aratni* never, I believe, signifies "fore-arm"; and the definition of the fifth technicality shows that it cannot bear the import of 'elbow', its more ordinary signification, when it does not denominate a measure. Again, as it does not here mean 'fist',—one of its senses,—it seems likely that it must denote the ulnar side of the hand. So, indeed, the term is explained by Arjuna Miśra, where he comments on the *Mahábhárata, Vana-parvan, śl.* 15781. His words are: अरत्निना । करतलपार्श्वेन ।

‡ The Sanskrit has जानुभिः, simply. See note **, below.

§ I find a different reading. See note **, below. The Translator's definition, which is conjectural, is little likely to be correct.

|| पञ्चामुत्क्षेपणम् । परस्परं पादहतोद्धूननम् । Ratnagarbha.

¶ Variant: *prasṛishṭa.*

** The subjoined verse is rejected, without remark, by Ratnagarbha, and is absent from my two old copies of the mere text, but occurs, though uncommented, in Śrídhara's text, and in several of my MSS.:

जानुभिश्चाश्मनिर्घातैस्तथा बाहुविघट्टितैः ।

Some excellent copies give, instead of अश्मनिर्घातैः, अश्मभि-र्घातैः ।

Professor Wilson, when he accepted, in his translation, the seventh and eighth technicalities, should have accepted *aśma-nirgháta*, also, which cannot be divorced from the other two, since it stands, in the original, between them.

spectators.* In proportion as the contest continued, so Cháńúra was gradually losing something of his original vigour,† and the wreath upon his head trembled from his fury and distress;[1] whilst the world-comprehending‡ Kríshńa wrestled with him as if but in sport. Beholding Cháńúra losing, and Kríshńa gaining, strength, Kaḿsa, furious with rage, commanded the music to cease. As soon as the drums and trumpets were silenced, a numerous band of heavenly instruments was heard in the sky;§ and the gods invisibly exclaimed: "Victory to Govinda! Keśava, kill the demon Cháńúra!" Madhusúdana, having, for a long time, dallied with his adversary, at last lifted him up,

---

contest specified as "one without weapons"|| (अशस्त्रं * * युद्धम्).¶

[1] Kríshńa contended with Cháńúra, "who, through distress and anger, shook the flowers of his crest:"

खेदाच्चालयता कोपान्निजशेखरकेसरम् ।

The two last terms are explained: "the flower of the wreath on his head:" स्वशीर्षापीडभूतं पुष्पम् ।**

---

* अशस्त्रमतिघोरं तत्तयोर्युद्धं सुदारुणम् ।
बलप्राणविनिष्पाद्यं समाजोत्सवसंनिधौ ॥

† प्राणहानिमवापाग्र्यां तावत्तावन्नवाल्नवम् ।

‡ *Jagan-maya.*

§ मृदङ्गादिषु तूर्येषु प्रतिषिद्धेषु तत्क्षणात् ।
खे संगतान्यवाद्यन्त देवतूर्याण्यनेकशः ॥

|| As to the use of stones in the combat, which is designated as *aśastra,* we must suppose,—if the verse quoted above has not been foisted into the text,—that the term *śastra,* embodied in this epithet, is employed technically, so as to comprehend those rude and ready missiles.

¶ See note *, above.

** Ratnagarbha.

and whirled him round, with the intention of putting an end to him. Having whirled Cháńúra round a hundred times, until his breath was expended in the air, Kŕishńa* dashed him on the ground, with such violence as to smash his body into a hundred fragments, and strew the earth with a hundred pools of gory mire.† Whilst this took place, the mighty Baladeva was engaged, in the same manner, with the demon bruiser,‡ Mushťika. Striking him on the head with his fists, and on the breast with his knees, he stretched him on the ground, and pummelled him there, till he was dead. Again, Kŕishńa encountered the royal bruiser § Tosalaka,|| and felled him to the earth with a blow of his left hand. When the other athletæ¶

* Called, in the original, not by his name, but by the epithet *amitrajit*.

† भूमावास्फोटितस्तेन चाणूरः शतधा व्रजन् ।
रक्तस्रावमहापङ्कां चकार शतधा भुवम् ॥

‡ *Malla*.

§ *Malla-rája*, "prince of *mallas*". For *malla*, see note ¶, below.

|| Corrected from "Tomalaka". Professor Wilson's MS. may have shown a broken स. Most copies yield Tośalaka, the reading, apparently, accepted by Ratnagarbha, and that of the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, which has, likewise, the short form, Tośala. In very good MSS. of the *Harivaḿśa* I find Toshala and Toshalaka. Professor Wilson's Bengal translation has Salaka.

¶ *Malla*; which Professor Wilson renders, indifferently, by "athlete", "boxer", and "bruiser". The last two terms are inadequate, while the first is inadequative, as being much too wide for the occasion. 'Pancratiast', in an accommodated acceptation, may answer to represent *malla*; for the pancratiast fought nude, whereas it appears that his Hindu analogue contended clothed.

The fighting of Hari, Cháńúra, and Baladeva clearly evinces, that the *malla-yuddha* corresponded to the classical παγκράτιον or παμμάχιον,—not, indeed, the regular agonism, so much as the lawless description that was practised at Sparta,—the characteristic of which was a combination of boxing and wrestling.

saw Cháńúra, Mushťika, and Tosalaka killed, they fled (from the field); and Kŕishńa and Sankarshańa danced, victorious,* on the arena, dragging along with them, by force, the cowherds of their own age. Kaḿsa, his eyes reddening with wrath, called aloud to the surrounding people: "Drive those two cowboys out of the assembly: seize the villain Nanda; and secure him with chains of iron: put Vasudeva to death with tortures intolerable to his years: and lay hands upon† the cattle, and whatever else belongs to those cowherds who are the associates of Kŕishńa."

Upon hearing these orders, the destroyer of Madhu laughed at Kaḿsa, and, springing up to the place

---

Nílakańťha, commenting on the *Mahábhárata, Vana-parvan, śl.* 15779, quotes from some *Níti-śástra*, as follows:

वामपाणिकचोत्पीडा भूमौ निष्पेषणं बलात् ।
मूर्ध्नि पादप्रहरणं जानुनोदरमर्दनम् ॥
मालूराकारया मुष्ट्या कपोले दृढताडनम् ।
कफोणिपातोऽप्यसकृत्सर्वतस्तलताडनम् ।
तालेन युद्धे भ्रामणं मारणं स्मृतमष्टधा ॥
चतुर्भिः क्षत्त्रियं हन्यात्पञ्चभिः क्षत्त्रियाधमम् ।
षड्भिर्वैश्यं सप्तभिस्तु शूद्रं संकरमष्टभिः ॥

It appears, from this, that the Hindu pancratium recognized eight modes of procedure: tearing out the hair, felling to the ground, kicking on the head, punching the belly with the knee, pommelling the cheeks with clenched fists, elbowing, slapping, and whirling round. Four of these modes of annoyance, counted from the first, are reckoned legitimate as against an ordinary Kshattriya; five, as against a reprobate or titular Kshattriya; six, as against a Vaiśya; seven, as against a Śúdra; and all eight, as against an adversary of mixed extraction.

Our modern fancy have nothing to learn, on the score of humanity, from their Aryan predecessors of the ring, any more than from the roughs of Sparta, among whom even biting and scratching were not accounted foul play.

* *Harshita*, 'delighted.'

† Insert 'the towns', *pur*.

where he was seated, laid hold of him by the hair of his head, and struck his tiara* to the ground. Then, casting him down upon the earth, Govinda threw himself upon him. Crushed by the weight of the upholder of the universe, the son of Ugrasena (Kaḿsa), the king, gave up the ghost. Kŕishńa† then dragged the dead body, by the hair of the head, into the centre of the arena; and a deep furrow was made by the vast and heavy carcass of Kaḿsa, when it was dragged along the ground by Kŕishńa, as if a torrent of water had run through it.[1] Seeing Kaḿsa thus treated, his brother Sunáman‡ came (to his succour): but he was encountered, and easily killed, by Balabhadra. Then arose a general cry of grief from the surrounding

---

1 Et latus mediam sulcus diducit arenam.§

The yielding sand being furrowed into a ditch, or a water-course, by the dead bodies being dragged over it.

The text is:

गौरवेणातिमहता परिखा तेन कृष्यता ।
कृता कंसस्य देहेन वेगेनेव महाम्भसः ॥ ||

---

* *Kiríťa.*

† Madhusúdana, in the original.

‡ Corrected from "Sumálin". This mistake is easily accounted for. In Professor Wilson's favourite MS., which is carelessly transcribed, and has few of the copyist's inadvertencies corrected, we read:

सुमालिनामा बलभद्रेण लीलयैव निपातितः ।

Professor Wilson's Hindu-made version has Sumáli.

By striking out the syllables -मालि°, the verse is restored to its proper form. But the Translator, in due adherence to his copy, should have given the name as Sumálináman.

For Sunáman, see Vol. IV., p. 98.

§ This looks as if intended for Juvenal., Sat. I., 157:

Et latum media sulcum diducit arena.

|| Literally: "By the trailing body of Kaḿsa, with *its* prodigious weight, a channel *was* made, as by the velocity of a great stream."

circle, as they beheld the king of Mathurá* (thus) slain, (and treated) with (such) contumely, by Kŕishńa. Kŕishńa, accompanied by Balabhadra, embraced the feet of Vasudeva and of Devakí: but Vasudeva raised him up;† and, he and Devakí recalling to recollection what he had said to them at his birth, they bowed to Janárdana; and the former thus addressed him: "Have compassion upon mortals, O god, benefactor,‡ and lord of deities. It is by thy favour to us two, that thou hast become the (present) upholder (of the world). That, for the punishment of the rebellious,§ thou hast descended (upon earth,) in my house, having been propitiated (by my prayers), sanctifies our race. Thou art the heart|| of all creatures; thou abidest in all creatures; and all that has been, or will be, emanates from thee, O universal spirit.¶ Thou, Achyuta, who comprehendest all the gods, art eternally worshipped with sacrifices: thou art sacrifice itself, and the offerer of sacrifices. The affection that inspires my heart, and the heart of Devakí, towards thee, as if thou wast our child, is, indeed, but error and a great delusion.** How shall the tongue of a mortal such as I am call the creator of all things, who is without beginning or

---

* See Vol. IV., p. 338.

† The original makes both the father and mother show him this honour:

उत्थाप्य वसुदेवस्तं देवकी च जनार्दनम् ।

‡ *Varada.*

§ *Durvŕitta.*

|| *Anta.*

¶ प्रवर्तते समस्तात्मंस्त्वत्तो भूतभविष्यती ।

** सापह्नवं मम मनो यदेतत्त्वयि जायते ।
देवक्याश्चात्मजप्रीत्या तदत्यन्तविडम्बना ॥

end, son? Is it consistent that the lord of the world, from whom the world proceeds, should be born of me, except through illusion?* How should he, in whom all fixed and moveable things are contained, be conceived in the womb, and born of a mortal being?† Have compassion, therefore, indeed, O supreme lord, and, in thy descended portions, protect the universe. Thou art no son of mine. This whole world, from Brahmá to a tree,‡ thou art. Wherefore dost thou, who art one with the Supreme, beguile us? Blinded by delusion, I thought thee my son; and for thee, who art beyond all fear, I dreaded the anger of Kaḿsa; and, therefore, did I take thee, in my terror, to Gokula, where thou hast grown up. But I no longer claim thee as mine own.§ Thou, Vishńu,—the sovereign lord of all,|| whose actions Rudra, the Maruts, the Aświns, Indra,¶ and the gods cannot equal, although they behold them; thou, who hast come amongst us, for the benefit of the world,—art recognized; and delusion is no more."

---

* जगदेतज्जगन्नाथ संभूतमखिलं यतः ।
कया युक्त्या विना मायां सोऽस्मत्तः संभविष्यति ॥

† स कोष्ठोत्सङ्गशयनो मनुष्याज्जायते कथम् ।

‡ आब्रह्मपादपमयं जगदेतत् । See Vol. III., p. 202, note ||.

§ This sentence is not rendered very literally.

|| This phrase is to represent *íśa*.

¶ The original has Śatakratu. See Vol. I., p. 150.

CHAPTER XXI.

Kŕishńa encourages his parents; places Ugrasena on the throne; becomes the pupil of Sándípani, whose son he recovers from the sea: he kills the marine demon Panchajana, and makes a horn of his shell.

HAVING permitted to Devakí and Vasudeva (an interval of) true knowledge, through the contemplation of his actions, Hari again spread the delusions of his power* over (them and) the tribe of Yadu. He said to them: "Mother; venerable father; you have, both, been long observed, by Sankarshańa and myself, with sorrow, and in fear of Kaḿsa. He whose time passes not in respect to his father and mother is a vile being, who descends, in vain, from virtuous parents.† The lives of those produce good fruit who reverence their parents, their spiritual guides, the Brahmans, and the gods. Pardon, therefore, father, the impropriety of which we may have been culpable, in resenting, without your orders,—to which we acknowledge that we are subject,—the oppression we suffered from the power and violence of Kaḿsa."‡ Thus speaking, they offered homage to the elders of the Yadu tribe, in order, and, then, in a suitable manner, paid their respects to the citizens. The wives of Kaḿsa, and those of his father,§

---

* मायां * * वैष्णवीम् ।

† कुर्वतां याति यः कालो मातापित्रोरपूजनम् ।
तत्खण्डमायुषो व्यर्थं साधूनामुपजायते ॥

‡ This sentence is much expanded in translation.

§ मातरश्चास्य, "and his—*Kaḿsa's*—mothers," *i. e.*, it seems, his mother and his mother-in-law.

then surrounded the body of the king, lying on the ground, and bewailed his fate, in deep affliction. Hari, in various ways, expressed his regret (for what had chanced), and endeavoured to console them, his own eyes being suffused with tears. The foe of Madhu then liberated Ugrasena from confinement, and placed him on the throne, which the death of his son had left vacant.* The chief of the Yádavas,† being crowned, performed the funeral rites of Kaḿsa, and of the rest of the slain. When the ceremony was over, and Ugrasena had resumed his royal seat, Kŕishńa‡ (addressed him,) and said: "Sovereign lord, command, boldly, what else is to be done.§ The curse of Yayáti has pronounced our race unworthy of dominion;[1] but, with me for your servant, you may issue your orders to the gods. How should kings disobey them?"||

Thus having spoken, the human¶ Keśava summoned, mentally, the deity of the wind,—who came upon the instant,—and said to him: "Go, Váyu, to Indra, and desire him** to lay aside his pomp,†† and resign to

[1] The curse pronounced on the elder sons of Yayáti, on their refusing to take upon them their father's infirmities. See Vol. IV., p. 48.

* अभ्यषिञ्चत्तथैवैनं निजराज्ये हतात्मजम् ।

† *Yadu-siḿha.*

‡ Hari, in the original.

§ उवाचाज्ञापय विभो यत्कार्यमविशङ्कितः ।

|| मयि भृत्ये स्थिते देवानाज्ञापयतु किं नृपैः ।

¶ कार्यमानुषः ।

** Vásava, in the original.

†† 'Pride', rather,—*garva*; namely, says Retnagarbha, at the recollection of Kŕishńa's having lifted up Mount Govardhana.

Ugrasena his (splendid) hall, Sudharman.* Tell him that Kŕishńa commands him to send the royal hall, the unrivalled gem of princely courts, for the assemblage of the race of Yadu."† Accordingly, Váyu‡ went, and delivered the message to the husband of Śachí,§ who|| (immediately) gave up to him the hall Sudharman; and Váyu conveyed it to the Yádavas, the chiefs of whom, thenceforth, possessed this celestial court, emblazoned with jewels, and defended by the arm of Govinda.¶ The two excellent Yadu youths, versed in all knowledge, and possessed of all wisdom,** then submitted to instruction, as the disciples of teachers. Accordingly, they repaired to Sándípani—who, though born in Káśí,†† resided at Avantí,‡‡—to study (the science of) arms, and, becoming his pupils, were obedient and attentive to their master; exhibiting

---

* Or the name may be read Sudharmá. Both forms are authorized.

† कृष्णो ब्रवीति राजार्हमेतद्रत्नमनुत्तमम् ।
सुधर्माख्या सभा युक्तमस्यां यदुभिरासितुम् ॥

‡ The Sanskrit has Pavana.

§ In the original, Śachípati, an epithetical designation of Indra. See Vol. II., p. 72, note 2.

|| Here the original calls Indra by his appellation Purandara.

¶ वायुनोपहृतां दिव्यां सभां ते यदुपुङ्गवाः ।
बुभुजुः सर्वरत्नाढ्यां गोविन्दभुजसंश्रयात् ॥

The ordinary reading, and that accepted by Ratnagarbha, ends the second line with -संश्रयाः ।

** *Sarva-jnána-maya.*

†† *Káśya*, "of the Káśi tribe." See my *Benares*, &c., p. 9, note 1; also, Vol. IV., p. 345, supplement to p. 159, note ††. But the Translator has the support of both the commentators. *Káśya* is the word used in the corresponding passage of the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, *viz.*, X., Prior Section, XLV., 31; but Śrídhara offers no explanation of it.

‡‡ The city so called. The Sanskrit has *Avantipura*. See Vol. III., p. 246. I have corrected "Avanti".

an example, to all men, of the observance of instituted rules.* In the course of sixty-four days,† they had gone through the elements of military science, with the treatises on the use of arms, and directions for the mystic incantations, which secure the aid of supernatural weapons.[1]‡ Sándípani, astonished at such proficiency, and knowing that it exceeded human faculties, imagined that the Sun and Moon had become his scholars. When they had acquired all that he could teach, they said to him: "Now say what present shall be given to you, as the preceptor's fee."§ The prudent Sándípani, perceiving that they were endowed with more than mortal powers, requested them to give him his dead son, (drowned) in the sea of Prabhása.[2]

---

[1] They read through the Dhanur-veda,|| which treats of military matters; with the Rahasya, 'the mystical part,'¶ and the Sangraha, 'collection' or 'compendium',—said to be, here, the Astra-prayoga,** 'the employment of weapons.'

[2] Prabhása is a place of pilgrimage in the west of India, on the coast of Gujerat, near the temple of Somanátha, and town of Puttun Somnath. It is also known by the name of Somatírtha; Soma, or the Moon, having been here cured of the con-

---

* "An example of the observance of instituted rules" is to translate *áchára*. See Vol. III., p. 107, note ‡.

† *Ahorátra*, 'nycthemera.' The term, apparently, is chosen with a view to imply diligent studentship.

‡ These three expansions are to represent the expressions specified in note 1 in this page.

§ *Guru-dakshiṅá.*

|| See Vol. III., p. 67.

¶ The *mantras* and Upanishads, the commentators allege.

** Śrídhara and Ratnagarbha.

Taking up their arms, they marched against the Ocean. But the all-comprehending Sea said to them: "I have not killed the son of Sándípani.* A demon† named Panchajana,‡ (who lives) in the form of a conch-shell, seized the boy. He is still under my waters.§ On hearing this, Kŕishńa plunged into the sea; and, having slain the vile Panchajana, he took the conch-shell,— which was formed of his bones, (and bore it as his horn),—the sound of which fills the demon-hosts with dismay, animates the vigour of the gods, and annihilates unrighteousness.|| The heroes also recovered the boy from the pains of death, and restored him, in his former person, to his father. Ráma and Janárdana

---

sumption brought upon him by the imprecation of Daksha, his father-in-law. Mahábhárata, Śalya Parvan; Vol. III., p. 249.

---

* गृहीतास्त्रौ ततस्तौ तु सार्घपात्रो महोदधिः ।
उवाच न मया पुत्रो हृतः सान्दीपनेरिति ॥

Various MSS. have, instead of सार्घपात्रः, सार्घहस्तः, पाद्यपात्रः, जनेनार्तः, and भयेनार्तः । It is impossible to say what reading the Translator accorded the preference to.

† *Daitya.*

‡ For his origin, see Vol. II., p. 69, note ||.

§ The Sea here addresses Kŕishńa as *asura-súdana*, "slayer of demons."

|| Professor Wilson has here omitted to translate a stanza, of some little importance, if only by way of connecting what precedes with what follows. It is recognized by both the commentators, and runs thus:

तं पाञ्चजन्यमापूर्य गत्वा यमपुरीं हरिः ।
बलदेवश्च बलवाञ्जित्वा वैवस्वतं यमम् ॥

We learn, from this, that Hari blew Pánchajanya,—the name of his newly acquired shell,—and proceeded to the city of Yama; and that Baladeva conquered Yama, son of Vivaswat.

For the origin of Yama, see Vol. III., p. 20; for the situation of Yama's city, Vol. II., p. 239.

then returned to Mathurá, which was well presided over* by Ugrasena, and abounded in a happy population, both of men and women.[1]

---

[1] The incidents of the two last chapters are related in the Bhágavata and Hari Vaṁśa,—often in the words of the text, but with many embellishments and additions, especially in the latter. The Brahma Vaivarta, on the other hand, makes still shorter work of these occurrences than our text.

---

* *Pálita.*

CHAPTER XXII.

Jarásandha besieges Mathurá; is defeated, but repeatedly renews the attack.

PARÁŚARA.—The mighty Kaṁsa had married the two daughters of Jarásandha,* one named Asti, the other, Prápti.† Jarásandha was king of Magadha,‡ and a very powerful prince;[1] who, when he heard that Kṛishṅa § had killed his son-in-law, was much incensed, and, collecting a large force, marched against Mathurá, determined to put the Yádavas and Kṛishṅa to the sword.|| Accordingly, he invested the city with three and twenty numerous divisions of his forces.[2] Ráma and Janárdana sallied from the town, with a slender, but resolute, force, and fought bravely with the armies

---

[1] See Vol. IV., pp. 150, 151.

[2] With twenty-three Akshauhiṅís, each consisting of 109,350¶ infantry, 65,610 horse, 21,870 chariots, and as many elephants.** The Hari Vaṁśa†† enumerates, as the allies, or tributaries, of Jarásandha, a number of princes from various parts of India. But this is a gratuitous embellishment.

---

* See Vol. IV., pp. 150 and 173; also, note in p. 344.

† Corrected from "Asti" and "Práptí".

‡ Corrected, here and everywhere, from "Magadha". See Vol. IV., p. 151, note ‡.

§ Hari, in the original.

|| This sentence is rendered with great looseness.

¶ Corrected from "109,300".

** So say the commentators on the *Amara-kośa*, II., VIII., II., 49. For a venerable statement of the component parts of an *akshauhiṅí*, see the *Mahábhárata*, *Ádi-parvan*, *śl.* 292—296.

†† *Śl.* 5013—5022.

of Magadha.* The two youthful leaders prudently resolved to have recourse to their ancient weapons; and, accordingly, the bow of Hari, with two quivers filled with exhaustless† arrows, and the mace‡ called Kaumodakí,§ and the ploughshare|| of Balabhadra, as well as the club ¶ Saunanda, descended, at a wish, from heaven. Armed with these weapons, they (speedily) discomfited the king of Magadha and his hosts, and reentered the city, (in triumph).

Although the wicked (king of Magadha,) Jarásandha was defeated, yet Kṙishṅa knew, that, whilst he escaped alive, he was not subdued; and, in fact, he soon returned, with a (mighty) force, and was again forced, by Ráma and Kṙishṅa, to fly. Eighteen times[1] did the haughty prince of Magadha** renew his attack

---

[1] The Bhágavata†† and Hari Vaṁśa‡‡ say 'seventeen times.' The latter indulges in a prolix description of the first encounter, nothing of which occurs in the Bhágavata, any more than in our text.

---

* निष्क्रम्याल्पपरीवारावुभौ रामजनार्दनौ ।
युयुधाते समं तस्य बलिनौ बलिसैनिकैः ॥

† *Akshaya*, 'indestructible.'

‡ *Gadá*.

§ A present from Varuṅa, according to the *Mahábhárata*, *Ádi-parvan*, *śl.* 8200. It takes its name from Kumodaka, an epithetical appellation of Kṙishṅa.

|| *Hala*, which means, ordinarily, 'plough.' For its synonym, *sira*, synecdochically used in the same way as in the text, see Vol. III., p. 332, note ¶.

¶ *Musala*; a weapon shaped like a pestle, it should seem.

** To render मागधो राजा ।

†† X., Latter Section, I., 44.

‡‡ *Śl.* 5126.

upon the Yádavas, headed by Kŕishńa, and was as often defeated and put to the rout, by them, with very inferior numbers. That the Yádavas were not overpowered by their foes was owing to the present might of the portion of the discus-armed Vishńu.* It was the pastime † of the lord of the universe, in his capacity of man, to launch various ‡ weapons against his enemies: (for) what effort of power to annihilate his foes could be necessary to him whose fiat creates and destroys the world? But, as subjecting himself to human customs, he formed alliances with the brave, and engaged in hostilities with the base. § He had recourse to the four devices of policy,—or, negotiation, presents, sowing dissension, and chastisement, ||—and, sometimes, even betook himself to flight. Thus, imitating the conduct of human beings, the lord of the world pursued, at will, his sports. ¶

---

* यद्बलं यादवानां तैरजितं यदनेकशः ।
तत्तु संनिधिमाहात्म्यं विष्णोरंशस्य चक्रिणः ॥

† *Lílá.* See Vol. IV., p. 325, note §.

‡ *Aneka-rúpa.*

§ तथापि यो मनुष्याणां धर्मस्तमनुवर्तते ।
कुर्वन्बलवता संधिं हीनैर्युद्धं करोत्यसौ ॥

Ratnagarbha reads the first verse as follows:

तथा ये ये मनुष्याणां धर्मास्तदनुवर्तनम् ।

Other variants, of little importance, might be added from my MSS. unaccompanied by commentary.

|| *Sáman*, *upapradána*, *bheda*, and *dańda-páta.* See, further, the *Amara-kośa*, II., VIII., I., 20.

¶ मनुष्यदेहिनां चेष्टामित्येवमनुवर्ततः ।
लीला जगत्पतेस्तस्य च्छन्दतः संप्रवर्तते ॥

CHAPTER XXIII.

Birth of Kálayavana: he advances against Mathurá. Kŕishńa builds Dwáraká, and sends thither the Yádava tribe: he leads Kálayavana into the cave of Muchukunda: the latter awakes, consumes the Yavana king, and praises Kŕishńa.

PARÁŚARA.—Śyála* having called Garga,† the Brahman, whilst at the cow-pens, impotent, in an assembly of the Yádavas,‡ they all laughed; at which he was highly offended, and repaired to the shores§ of the western sea,|| where he engaged in arduous penance, to obtain a son, who should be a terror to the tribe of Yadu.¶ Propitiating Mahádeva, and living upon iron-sand** for twelve years, the deity†† (at last) was pleased with him, and gave him the (desired) boon. The king of the Yavanas, who was childless,

---

* On the credit of both the commentators, we here have no proper name, but the word for brother-in-law, *śyála*. According to Ratnagarbha, Śiśiráyańa is thus alluded to, and proleptically; for Garga was still to marry his sister, Gaurí.

† Corrected from "Gárgya", with the suffrage of several MSS. Probably the Garga is meant who—as we read in the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, X., Prior Section, Chapter XLV.,—served as instructor to Kŕishńa and Balaráma. See Vol. IV., p. 279. But Gárgya seems to be the reading of the *Harvamśa*, *śl.* 1957—1959.

Two Gargas, then, are named in the present Chapter. See p. 58, *infra*.

‡ यदूनां संनिधौ ।

§ There is no word for this in the Sanskrit.

|| Instead of *dakshińábdhi*, the reading of Śrídhara, most MSS. have *dakshińápatha*, 'the south', the lection preferred by Ratnagarbha.

¶ सुतमिच्छंस्तपस्तेपे यदुचक्रभयावहम् ।

** *Ayaś-chúrńa*; 'iron-filings', more likely.

†† Hara, in the original.

became the friend of Garga;* and the latter begot a son, by his wife, who was as (black as) a bee, and was, thence, called Kálayavana.[1] The Yavana king, having placed his son, whose breast was as hard as the point of the thunderbolt, upon the throne, retired to the woods. Inflated with conceit of his prowess, Kálayavana demanded of Nárada who were the most mighty heroes on earth. To which the sage answered "The Yádavas." Accordingly, Kálayavana assembled many myriads of Mlechchhas and barbarians,[2]† and, with a

[1] This legend of the origin of Kálayavana is given, also, by the Hari Vaḿśa.‡ The Bhágavata, like our text, comes, at once, to the siege of Mathurá by this chief; but the Hari Vaḿśa suspends the story, for more than thirty chapters, to narrate an origin of the Yádavas, and sundry adventures of Kŕishńa and Ráma to the south-west. Most of these have no other authority, and are, no doubt, inventions of the Dakhní compiler; and the others are misplaced.

[2] So the Bhágavata describes him,§ as leading a host of Mlechchhas (or barbarians) against Kŕishńa; but, in the Mahábhárata,—Sabhá Parvan, Vol. I., p. 330,—where Kŕishńa describes the power of Jarásandha, he admits that he and the Yádavas fled from Mathurá to the west, through fear of that king; but no account is given of any siege of Mathurá by Kálayavana. The only indication of such a person is the mention,|| that Bhagadatta,

* स भाजयामास च तं यवनेशो ह्यनात्मजः ।

The original, it will be observed, does not here name Garga, which I have corrected from "Gárgya".

† म्लेच्छकोटीसहस्राणां सहस्रैर्बहुभिर्वृतः ।

‡ Chapter CXV.

§ It calls him Yavana the Asura.

|| *Śl.* 578, 579:

मुरं च नरकं चैव शास्ति यो यवनाधिपः ।
अपर्यन्तबलो राजा प्रतीच्यां वरुणो यथा ॥

vast armament of elephants, cavalry, and foot, advanced, impatiently, against Mathurá and the Yádavas;

---

the Yavana king, who rules over Muru* and Naraka, in the west and south, is one of his most attached feudatories. This king is, in various other places, called king of Prágjyotisha; as he is in a subsequent passage of the same book,—Sabhá Parvan, p. 374;† and this name is always applied to the the west of Assam.‡ His subjects are, however, still Yavanas and Mlechchhas; and he presents horses, caps set with jewels, and swords with ivory hilts, —articles scarcely to be found in Assam, which cannot well be the seat of his sovereignty. It seems most likely, therefore, that the story may have originated in some knowledge of the power and position of the Greek-Bactrian princes, or their Scythian successors; although, in the latter compilations, it has been mixed up with allusions to the first Mohammedan aggressions. See Asiatic Researches, Vol. VI., p. 506, and Vol. XV., p. 100.

भगदत्तो महाराज वृद्धस्तव पितुः सखा ।
स वाचा प्रणतस्तस्य कर्मणा च विशेषतः ॥

Here, Bhagadatta—with the epithet *aparyanta-bala*, 'of boundless might',—is said to be paramount over Muru and Naraka, in like manner as Varuńa rules the west. The direction of Bhagadatta's kingdom is not assigned.

M. Fauche's translation of this passage, while correcting Professor Wilson's view of its meaning, as to some points, turns an epithet into a king, and gives him what belongs to Bhagadatta:

"De lui relève encore le roi Aparyantabala, souverain des Yavanas, qui règne sur le Mourou et le Naraka, comme Varouńa sur la plage occidentale;

"Et Bhagadatta, le vieil ami de ton père, *Bhagadatta*, qui se courbe plus que toute autre, puissant roi, devant sa parole et son geste."

For the position of Varuńa's city, see Vol. II., p. 239.

* It has more than once been conjectured that we should read Maru, in this place. But Muru and Naraka, I take it, are, here, not names of countries,—as is generally supposed,—but two demons, so called, at last slain by Kríshńa. See Chapter XXIX. of this Book.

† *Śl.* 1836.

‡ *I. e.*, to the ancient Kámarúpa; for which see Vol. II., p. 132, and p. 133, note 1.

wearying, every day, the animal that carried him, but insensible of fatigue, himself.

When Kŕishńa knew of his approach, he reflected, that, if the Yádavas encountered the Yavana, they would be so much weakened by the conflict, that they would then be overcome by the king of Magadha;* that their force was much reduced by the war with Magadha,† whilst that of Kálayavana was unbroken; and that the enemy might be, therefore, victorious.‡ Thus, the Yádavas were exposed to a double danger.§ He resolved, therefore, to construct a citadel, for the Yadu tribe, that should not be easily taken,—one that even women might defend, and in which, therefore, the heroes of the house of Vŕishńi|| should be secure; one in which the male combatants of the Yádavas should dread no peril, though he, himself, should be drunk, or careless, asleep, or abroad. Thus reflecting, Kŕishńa¶ solicited a space of twelve furlongs from the ocean; and there he built the city of Dwáraká,[1] defended by high ramparts,** and beautified with gardens

[1] According to the Mahábhárata, he only enlarged and fortified the ancient city of Kuśasthalí, founded by Raivata. Sabhá Parvan.†† See, also, Vol. III., p. 253, of this work.

* कृष्णोऽपि चिन्तयामास क्षयितं यादवं बलम् ।
यवनेन रणे गम्यं मागधस्य भविष्यति ।

† Literally, "by the king of the Magadhas," मागधेन ।

‡ A free translation; and so is much of what follows.

§ There is no Sanskrit for this sentence. It is taken from the commentaries.

|| *Vŕishńi-pungava.* For Vŕishńi, see Vol. IV., p. 58.

¶ The original has Govinda.

** *Mahá-vapra.*

†† *Śl.* 614. M. Fauche, in his translation, converts Raivata into a mountain.

and reservoirs of water, crowded with houses and buildings,* and splendid as the capital of Indra, Amarávatí.† Thither Janárdana conducted the inhabitants of Mathurá, and then awaited, at that city, the approach of Kálayavana.‡

When the hostile army encamped round Mathurá, Kŕishńa,§ unarmed, went forth, and beheld the Yavana king. Kálayavana, the strong-armed, recognizing Vásudeva, pursued him,—him whom the thoughts of perfect ascetics|| cannot overtake. Thus pursued, Kŕishńa entered a large cavern, where Muchukunda, the king of men, was asleep. The rash¶ Yavana, entering (the cave), and beholding a man lying asleep there, concluded it must be Kŕishńa, and kicked him; at which Muchukunda awoke, and, casting on him an angry glance, the Yavana was instantly consumed, and reduced to ashes.** For, in a battle between the gods and demons, Muchukunda had, formerly, contributed to the defeat of the latter; and, being overcome with sleep, he solicited of the gods, as a boon, that he should enjoy a long repose. "Sleep long, and soundly,"†† said the gods; "and whoever disturbs you shall be instantly burnt to ashes by fire emanating from your body."[1]

---

[1] The name of Muchukunda, as one of the sons of Mándhátŕi,‡‡

---

* *Prákára*; 'strong buildings', Ratnagarbha says.

† See Vol. II., p. 240, text and notes.

‡ आसन्ने कालयवने मथुरां च स्वयं ययौ ।

§ The Sanskrit has Govinda. || *Mahá-yogin.* ¶ *Sudurmati.*

** दृष्टमात्रस्तु तेनासौ जज्वाल यवनोऽग्निना ।
तत्क्रोधजेन मैत्रेय भस्मीभूतश्च तत्क्षणात् ॥

†† These words are interpolated by the Translator.

‡‡ Corrected from "Mańdhátri".

Having burnt up the iniquitous Yavana, and beholding the foe of Madhu, Muchukunda asked him who he was. "I am born," he replied, "in the Lunar race, in the tribe of Yadu, and am the son of Vasudeva." Muchukunda, recollecting the prophecy of old Garga, fell down before the lord of all, Hari, saying:" Thou art known, supreme lord, to be a portion of Vishńu;* for it was said, of old, by Garga,† that, at the end of the twenty-eighth Dwápara age, Hari would be born in the family of Yadu. Thou art he, without doubt,—the benefactor of mankind; for thy glory I am unable to endure. Thy words are of deeper tone than the muttering of the rain-cloud; and earth sinks down beneath the pressure of thy feet. As, in the battle between the gods and demons, the Asuras were unable to sustain my lustre, so even am I incapable of bearing thy radiance.‡ Thou alone art the refuge of every

occurs in Vol. III., p. 268; but no further notice is taken of him. The Bhágavata§ specifies his being the son of that king, and relates the same story of his long sleep as the text. The same occurs in the Hari Vaḿśa.|| The general character of the legends in this chapter is that of reference to something familiar, rather than its narration. In the Hari Vaḿśa the opposite extreme is observable; and there the legends are as prolix as here they are concise. The Bhágavata follows a middle course; but it seems unlikely, that, in either of the three, we have the original fables.

* प्राह ज्ञातो भवान्विष्णोरंशस्त्वं परमेश्वरः ।

Instead of विष्णोरंशः, some MSS. have विष्णुः पूर्णः ।

† Probably, the Garga mentioned in Vol. II., p. 213.

‡ देवासुरे महायुद्धे दैत्यसैन्ये महाभटाः ।
न शेकुर्मम तत्तेजस्त्वत्तेजो न सहाम्यहम् ॥

§ X., Latter Section, II.

|| Chapter CXV.

living being who has lighted on the world. Do thou, who art the alleviator of all distress, show favour upon me, and remove from me all that is evil.* Thou art the oceans, the mountains, the rivers, the forests; thou art earth, sky, air, water, and fire: thou art mind, intelligence, the unevolved principle,† the vital airs, the lord of life; the soul;‡ all that is beyond the soul; the all-pervading; exempt from the vicissitudes of birth; devoid of (sensible properties,) sound and the like; undecaying, illimitable, imperishable, subject neither to increase nor diminution:§ thou art that which is Brahma,—without beginning or end. From thee the immortals, the progenitors, the Yakshas, Gandharvas,|| and Kimnaras, the Siddhas, the nymphs of heaven,¶ men, animals,** birds, reptiles,†† deer,‡‡ and all the vegetable world, proceed; and all that has been, or will be, or is now, moveable or fixed. All that is amorphous, or has form; all that is gross, subtile, moveable, or stable,§§ thou art, O creator of the world; and beside thee there is not anything. O lord, I have been whirl-

---

* संप्रसीद प्रपन्नार्तिहर्ता हर ममाशुभम् ।

† *Avyákṛita.*

‡ *Puṁs.*

§ *Náśa.*

|| Corrected from "Gandharbhas".

¶ *Apsaras.*

** *Paśu,* which often means 'sacrificial animals'. Compare the title Paśupati; also, the terms *paśubandha* and *nirúḍhapaśubandha,* Vol. III., p. 40, note §, and p. 113, note †.

†† *Sarisṛipa*; rather "reptiles" than "insects", as it is rendered in Vol. II., p. 92.

‡‡ 'Wild beasts', rather; *mṛiga.*

§§ Ratnagarbha has, instead of सूक्ष्मं चरं स्थिरं, सूक्ष्मतरं तथा: and this reading gets rids of two tautologies; for "moveable or fixed" occurs just before.

ed round, in the circle of worldly existence, for ever; and have suffered the three classes of affliction;* and there is no rest† whatever. I have mistaken pains for pleasures, like sultry vapours‡ for a pool of water; and their enjoyment has yielded me nothing but sorrow.§ The earth, dominion,|| forces, treasures, friends,¶ children, wife, dependants, all the objects of sense,** have I possessed, imagining them to be sources of happiness; but I found, that, in their changeable nature,†† O lord, they were nothing but vexation. The gods themselves, though (high) in heaven, were in need of my alliance. Where, then, is everlasting repose? Who, without adoring thee,—who art the origin of all worlds,—shall attain, O supreme deity, that rest which endures for ever? Beguiled by thy delusions, and

---

* These are alluded to in the opening stanza of the *Sánkhya-káriká*:

दुःखत्रयाभिघाताज्जिज्ञासा तदपघातके हेतौ ।
दृष्टे सापार्था चेन्नैकान्तात्यन्तोऽभावात् ॥

"Because of the disquietude *which results* from threefold pain, *there arises* a desire to know the means of doing away therewith *effectually*. If *it be objected, that*, visible *means to this end being available*, such *desire* is unprofitable, I demur; for that *these means do* not, entirely and for ever, *operate exemption from disquietude*."

The three sorts of pain, the *ádhyátmika*, *ádhibhautika*, and *ádhidaivika*, are, in the words of Colebrooke, "evil proceeding from self," "from external beings," and "from divine causes". See his *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., p. 238.

† *Nirvŕiti.*

‡ *Mŕiga-tŕishńá*, the mirage.

§ तथा नाथ गृहीतानि तानि तापाय चाभवन् ।

|| *Ráshtŕa.*

¶ Insert 'adherents', *paksha*.

** शब्दाद्या विषयाः ।

†† परिणामे, 'in the end,' 'at last,' 'after all.'

ignorant of thy nature,* men, after suffering the various penalties of birth, death, and infirmity, behold the countenance of the king of ghosts,† and suffer, in hell, dreadful tortures,—the reward of their own deeds. Addicted to sensual objects, through thy delusions I revolve in the whirpool of selfishness and pride; and, hence, I come to thee, as my final refuge, who art the lord deserving of all homage, than whom there is no other asylum;‡ my mind afflicted with repentance for my trust in the world, and desiring the fulness of felicity, emancipation from all existence."§

---

* अस्वरूपविद्स्तव ।

† *Preta-rája*, an epithet of Yama.

‡ परमपदं यतो न किंचित् ।

§ निर्वाणे परिणतधाम्नि साभिलाषः ।

This means: "longing for emancipation,—of uncreated glory." So says Ratnagarbha, who also allows the epithet of 'emancipation' to signify "resort of perfect *yogins*". Śrídhara gives the second interpretation only.

The 'emancipation' of the Hindus is not release "from all existence", but from consciousness of pleasure and pain. The distinction is, at all events, good, as a piece of idealism.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Muchukunda goes to perform penance. Kŕishńa takes the army and treasures of Kálayavana, and repairs, with them, to Dwáraká. Balaráma visits Vraja: inquiries of its inhabitants after Kŕishńa.

THUS praised by the wise Muchukunda, the sovereign of all things, the eternal lord, Hari, said to him: "Go to whatever celestial regions you wish, lord of men, possessed of might irresistible, honoured* by my favour. When you have fully enjoyed all heavenly pleasures, you shall be born in a distinguished family, retaining the recollection of your former births; and you shall, finally, obtain emancipation."† Having heard this promise, and prostrated himself before Achyuta, the lord of the world, Muchukunda went forth from the cave, and, beholding men of diminutive stature, now first knew that the Kali age had arrived. The king, therefore, departed to Gandhamádana,‡ the shrine § of Naranáráyańa,|| to perform penance.

Kŕishńa, having, by this stratagem, destroyed his

---

* *Upabŕiṁhita.*

† भुक्त्वा भोगान्महादिव्यान्भविष्यसि महाकुले ।
जातिस्मरो मत्प्रसादात्ततो मोक्षमवाप्स्यसि ॥

‡ Probably, the mountain spoken of in Vol. II., p. 115.

§ *Sthána.* A shrine of Naranáráyańa is referred to in Chapter XXXVII. of this Book.

|| A name of Kŕishńa, for which see the *Mahábhárata*, *Śánti-parvan*, *śl.* 12658; also, the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, V., XIX., 9.

"In various parts of the *Mahábhárata*, Kŕishńa and Arjuna are singularly represented as having formerly existed in the persons of two Ŕishis, Náráyańa and Nara, who always lived and acted together." *Original Sanskrit Texts*, Part IV., p. 192.

The Devarshis Nara and Náráyańa are mentioned in Vol. I., p. 111, note 1, and in Vol. III., p. 68, note 1. Also see Vol. IV., p. 246, note 1.

enemy, returned to Mathurá, and took captive his army, rich in horses, elephants, and cars, which he conducted to Dwáraká,* and delivered to Ugrasena; and the Yadu race was relieved from all fear of invasion.† Baladeva, when hostilities had entirely ceased, being desirous of seeing his kinsmen, went to Nanda's cow-pens,‡ and there again conversed with the herdsmen and their females, with affection and respect. By some, the elders, he was embraced; others, the juniors, he embraced; and with those of his own age, male or female, he talked and laughed.§ The cowherds made many kind speeches to Haláyudha;|| but some of the Gopís spoke to him with the affectation of anger,¶ or with feelings of jealousy, as they inquired after the loves of Kŕishńa with the women of Mathurá. "Is all well with the fickle and inconstant Kŕishńa?" said they. "Does the volatile swain, the friend of an instant, amuse the women of the city by laughing at our rustic efforts (to please him)? Does he ever think of us, singing in chorus to his songs? Will he not come here once again, to see his mother? But why talk of these things? It is a different tale to tell, for him without us, and for us without him. Father,

---

* The original has Dwáravatí, of which "Dwáraká" is a synonym.

† *Parábhibhava.*

‡ *Nanda-gokula.*

§ कैश्चापि संपरिष्वक्तः कांश्चित्स परिषस्वजे ।
हास्यं चक्रे समं कैश्चिद्गोपैर्गोपीजनैस्तथा ॥

The Translator's specifications of "elders", &c., are taken from the commentators.

|| "Ploughshare-weaponed," literally; a name of Baladeva or Balabhadra. *Vide supra*, p. 51, text and note ||.

¶ *Prema-kupita.* Compare the terms in Vol. IV., p. 323, notes § and **.

mother, brother, husband, kin,—what have we not abandoned for his sake? But he is a monument of ingratitude.* Yet tell us, does not Kŕishńa talk of coming here? Falsehood is never, O Kŕishńa, to be uttered by thee. Verily, this is Dámodara,† this is Govinda, who has given up his heart to the damsels of the city,—who has, no longer, any regard for us, but looks upon us with disdain."‡ So saying, the Gopís, whose minds were fixed on Kŕishńa,§ addressed Ráma, in his place, calling him Dámodara and Govinda,|| and laughed, and were merry;¶ and Ráma consoled them by communicating to them agreeable, modest, affectionate, and gentle messages from Kŕishńa. With the cowherds he talked mirthfully, as he had been wont to do, and rambled, along with them, over the lands of Vraja.[1]

---

[1] This visit of Balaráma to Vraja is placed, by the Hari-Vaḿśa, anterior to the fall of Mathurá; by the Bhágavata, long subsequent to the establishment of the Yadus at Dwáraká.

---

* अकृतज्ञध्वजः ।

† See Vol. IV., p 281.

‡ दामोदरोऽसौ गोविन्दः पुरस्त्रीसक्तमानसः ।
अपेतप्रीतिरस्मासु दुर्दर्शः प्रतिभाति नः ॥

"Of this Dámodara, *or* Govinda, whose heart is attached to the women of the city, the love has departed, as towards us; *and, therefore, he is* hard to be seen. *And yet* he delights us."

Ratnagarbha has दामोदरासौ; *i. e.*, he puts 'Dámodara' in the vocative. By reading, also, अप्रेतप्रीतिः,—in which, likewise, he is peculiar,—he gives the sentence a very different meaning; but his explanation of this expression by गतप्रीतिः can scarcely be accepted.

§ Hari, in the original.

|| The Sanskrit has Kŕishńa.

¶ आमन्त्रितः स कृष्णेति पुनर्दामोदरेति च ।
जहसुः सुस्वरं गोप्यो हरिणा हृतचेतसः ॥

CHAPTER XXV.

Balaráma finds wine in the hollow of a tree; becomes inebriated; commands the Yamuná to come to him, and, on her refusal, drags her out of her course: Lakshmí gives him ornaments and a dress: he returns to Dwáraká, and marries Revatí.

WHILST the mighty* Śesha,[1] † the upholder of the globe, was thus engaged in wandering amidst the forests, with the herdsmen, in the disguise of a mortal, —having rendered great services to earth, and still considering what more was to be achieved,—Varuńa,‡ in order to provide for his recreation, said to (his wife,) Váruńí § (the goddess of wine): "Thou, Madirá,|| art ever acceptable to the powerful Ananta. ¶ Go, therefore, auspicious and kind goddess,** and promote his enjoyments." Obeying these commands, Váruńí went and established herself in the hollow of a Kadamba-tree, in the woods of Vŕindávana. Baladeva, roaming about, (came there, and,) smelling the pleasant fragrance of liquor,†† resumed his ancient passion for strong drink. The holder of the ploughshare,‡‡ observ-

[1] The great serpent, of whom Balaráma is an incarnation.

* *Mahátman.*

† See Vol. II., pp. 74, 85, and 211, note 1.

‡ See Vol. II., p. 85.

§ See Vol. I., p. 146, note 1; and Vol. II., p. 212.

|| Different, of course, from the Madirá named in Vol. IV., p. 109.

¶ The same as Śesha. See Vol. II., p. 211.

** गच्छ मुदे शुभे। Ratnagarbha reads, instead of मुदे, मुदा।

†† *Madirá.*

‡‡ Lángalin, in the original; the same, in effect, as Haláyudha. *Vide supra*, p. 63, note ||.

ing the vinous drops distilling from the Kadamba-tree, was much delighted, (and gathered) and quaffed them,[1] along with the herdsmen and the Gopís; whilst those who were skilful with voice and lute celebrated him in their songs.* Being inebriated (with the wine), and the drops of perspiration standing like pearls upon his limbs, he called out, not knowing what he said:"† Come hither, Yamuná river. I want to bathe." The river, disregarding the words of a drunken man, came not (at his bidding). On which, Ráma,‡ in a rage,

---

[1] There is no vinous exudation from the Kadamba-tree (Nauclea Kadamba); but its flowers are said to yield a spirit, by distillation;—whence Kádambarí§ is one of the synonyms of wine, or spirituous liquor. The grammarians, however, also derive the word from some legend; stating it to be so called, because it was produced from the hollow of a Kadamba-tree on the Gomanta|| mountain: गोमन्तपर्वते कदम्बकोटराज्जाता। The Hari Vaṁśa,¶ which alone makes the Gomanta mountain the scene of an exploit of Kŕishńa and Ráma, makes no mention of this origin of wine; and the Bhágavata** merely says, that Váruńí took up her abode in the hollow of a tree.†† There must be some other authority, therefore, for this story.

---

* उपगीयमानो ललितं गीतवाद्यविशारदैः।

This verse, it is observable, has an excessive syllable at the end of its first half.

† *Vihwala.*

‡ The Sanskrit has Lángalin. See the preceding page, note ‡‡.

§ Personified, Kádambarí is said to be daughter of Chitraratha and Madirá. For Chitraratha, see Vol. II., p. 86, note 1.

|| Corrected, here and below,—and in the Sanskrit,—from "Gomantha". For the mountain in question, see Vol. II., p. 141, note 2, *ad finem.* The *Harivaṁśa* places it near the Sahya mountains.

¶ Chapter XCVII.

** X., Latter Section, XVI., 19.

†† Compare the *Harivaṁśa*, Chapter XCVIII.

took up his ploughshare,* which he plunged into her bank, and dragged her to him, calling out:† "Will you not come, you jade?‡ Will you not come? Now go where you please, (if you can)." Thus saying, he compelled the dark river to quit its ordinary course, and follow him whithersoever he wandered through the wood.§ Assuming a mortal figure,|| the Yamuná, with distracted looks, approached Balabhadra,¶ and entreated him** to pardon her, and let her go. But he replied: "I will drag you with my ploughshare, in a thousand directions, since you contemn my prowess and strength."†† At last, however, appeased by her reiterated prayers, he let her go, after she had watered all the country.[1]‡‡ When he had bathed, the goddess

[1] The Bhágavata and Hari Vaṁśa§§ repeat this story; the latter, very imperfectly. The former adds, that the Yamuná is

* *Hala.* *Vide supra*, p. 51, note ||.

† गृहीत्वा तां तटे तेन चकर्ष मदविह्वलः ।

‡ *Pápa.*

§ सा क्षष्टा सहसा तेन मार्गं संत्यज्य निम्नगा ।
यत्रास्ते बलभद्रोऽसौ प्लावयामास तद्वनम् ॥

Śrídhara, like one of my MSS. unaccompanied by commentary, has, not क्षष्टा, but कृष्णा, the reading followed by the Translator.

|| शरीरिणी ।

¶ Ráma, in the original.

** The Sanskrit here exhibits Musaláyudha, "Bludgeon-armed", a name of Baladeva. *Vide supra*, p. 51, note ¶.

†† सोऽब्रवीदवजानासि मम शौर्यबले यदि ।
सोऽहं त्वां हलपातेन विनेष्यामि सहस्रधा ॥

‡‡ इत्युक्तयातिसंत्रासात्तया नद्या प्रसादितः ।
भूभागे प्लाविते तस्मिन्मुमोच यमुनां बलः ॥

§§ Chapter CIII.

of beauty,* Lakshmí, came, and gave him a beautiful lotos to place in one ear, and an ear-ring for the other;† a fresh necklace of lotos-flowers, sent by Varuńa; and garments of a dark blue colour, as costly as the wealth of the ocean:‡ and, thus decorated with a lotos in one ear, a ring in the other,§ dressed in blue garments, and wearing a garland, Balaráma appeared united with loveliness. Thus decorated, Ráma sported two months in Vraja, and then returned to Dwáraká, where he married Revatí, the daughter of King Raivata,‖ by whom he had (two sons,) Niśatha¶ and Ulmuka.[1]

---

still to be seen following the course along which she was dragged by Balaráma. The legend, probably, alludes to the construction of canals from the Jumna, for the purposes of irrigation; and the works of the Mohammedans in this way—which are well known, —were, no doubt, preceded by similar canals, dug by order of Hindu princes.

[1] See Vol. IV., p. 109.

---

* The Sanskrit has only Kánti for "the goddess of beauty." It is a name of Lakshmí, who is mentioned, in the original, several stanzas further on.

† अवतंसोत्पलं चारु गृहीत्वैकं च कुण्डलम् ।

Professor Wilson has rendered the explanation of the commentators.

‡ This expression is to render *samudrárha*.

§ कृतावतंसः स तदा चारुकुण्डलभूषितः ।

‖ See Vol. III., pp. 249—254.

¶ Corrected from "Nishatha".

CHAPTER XXVI.

Kŕishńa carries off Rukmińí: the princes who come to rescue her repulsed by Balaráma. Rukmin overthrown, but, spared by Kŕishńa, founds Bhojakaía. Pradyumna born of Rukmińí.

BHÍSHMAKA* was king of Vidarbha,† residing at Kuńdina.[1]‡ He had a son named Rukmin, and a beautiful daughter termed Rukmińí. Kŕishńa fell in love with the latter,§ and solicited her in marriage; but her brother, who hated Kŕishńa,|| would not assent to the espousals. At the suggestion of Jarásandha, and with the concurrence of his son, the powerful (sovereign) Bhíshmaka affianced Rukmińí to Śiśupála.¶ In order to (celebrate) the nuptials, Jarásandha and other princes, the friends of Śiśupála,** assembled

---

[1] Vidarbha is the country of Berar; and the name remains in the present city of Beder. The capital, however, Kuńdinapura, is, commonly, identified with a place called Kundapoor, about forty miles north-east of Amarávatí (in Berar).

---

* The elongated form of Bhishma, as this king is called in the *Mahábhárata*.

† Literally, "in the country of the Vidarbhas": विदर्भविषये ।

‡ See Vol. II., p. 158, note 3.

§ And she, we are told, with him:

रुक्मिणीं चकमे कृष्णः सा च तं चारुहासिनी ।

Cháruhásiní is an epithet, not a second name, of Rukmińí. For Chárubásiní, another of Kŕishńa's numerous wives, see Vol. IV., p. 112; also, *infra*, p. 81, note §, and p. 83, note §.

|| Called Chakrin, in the Sanskrit.

¶ The beginning of this Chapter is translated in *Original Sanskrit Texts*, Part IV., p. 179, note 161.

** See Vol. IV., pp. 104 and 106.

in the capital of Vidarbha;* and Kŕishńa, attended by Balabhadra and many other Yádavas, also went to Kuńd́ina,† to witness the wedding. When there, Hari contrived, on the eve of the nuptials, to carry off the princess;[1] leaving Ráma and his kinsmen to sustain the weight of his enemies.‡ Pauńd́raka,§ the illustrious Dantavakra,|| Vidúratha,¶ Śiśupála, Jarásandha, Śálwa,** and other kings, indignant (at the insult), exerted themselves to kill Kŕishńa, but were repelled by Balaráma and the Yádavas.†† Rukmin, vowing that he would never enter Kuńd́ina again, until he had slain Keśava in fight, pursued and overtook him.‡‡ (In the combat that ensued), Kŕishńa destroyed, with his discus,§§ as if in sport, the host (of Rukmin),—with all

[1] When she had gone forth from the city to worship Ambiká: Bhágavata. Indráńí, the wife of Indra: Hari Vaḿśa.|||| Our text tells the circumstance more concisely than the others.

* भीष्मकस्य पुरीं जग्मुः ।

† Corrected, throughout this Chapter, from "Kundina".

‡ विपक्षभारमासज्य रामाद्येष्वथ बन्धुषु ।

§ See Chapter XXXIV. of this Book.

|| See Vol. IV., p. 103.

¶ *Vide ibid.*, p. 153.

** Exchanged for "Śalya", which I nowhere find, and which is, probably, corrupted from Śálya, a reading peculiar to Professor Wilson's favourite MS. Śálwa was king of the Saubhas, according to the *Harivaḿśa, śl.* 6143.

†† रामाद्यैर्यदुपुङ्गवैः ।

‡‡ हन्तुं कृष्णमभिद्रुतः ।

§§ The "discus", *chakra*, is not here mentioned; but Kŕishńa is designated as Chakrin. The original of the passage where the discus was supposed to be spoken of is as follows:

निर्जितः पातितश्चोर्व्यां लीलयैव स चक्रिणा

I find no reading but this.

|||| *Śl.* 6612.

its horse, and elephants, and foot, and chariots,—and overthrew him, and hurled him on the ground, and would have put him to death, but was withheld by the entreaties of Rukmińí.* "He is my only brother," she exclaimed, "and must not be slain by thee. Restrain your wrath, O divine lord; and give me my brother, in charity." Thus addressed by her, Kŕishńa, whom no acts affect,† spared Rukmin;[1] and he (in pursuance of his vow,) founded the city Bhojakaťa,[2]‡ and (ever afterwards) dwelt therein. § After the defeat of Rukmin, Kŕishńa|| married Rukmińí,¶ in due form; having, first, made her his own by the Rákshasa ritual.[3]** She bore him the gallant Pradyumna, a

---

[1] After depriving him of his eyebrows and hair. In the Bhágavata, Balaráma also interferes in favour of Rukmin, and reproves Kŕishńa for disfiguring him.

[2] Of course, this was somewhere in the neighbourhood of Kuńdina, or Vidarbha, and is, usually, supposed to be situated on the Narmadá.

[3] That is, by violence. Thus Manu: "The seizure of a maiden, by force, from her house, while she weeps, and calls for

---

* हन्तुं कृतमतिः कृष्णो रुक्मिणं युद्धदुर्मदम् ।
प्रणम्य याचितो ब्रह्मन्रुक्मिण्या भगवान्हरिः ॥

† *Aklishťa-karman.* See Vol. IV., p. 282, note †.

‡ See Vol. II., p. 158, note 3.

§ Ratnagarbha, with whom agree several of my MSS. unaccompanied by commentary, omits a passage of three stanzas, beginning with the verses cited in note *, above, and ending at the point indicated. Quite possibly, too, this passage has been unwarrantably introduced into the text as recognized by Śrídhara. He does not gloss any part of it.

|| Madhusúdana, in the original.

¶ She was one of Kŕishńa's chief wives. See Vol. IV., p. 112.

** See Vol. III., p. 105.

portion of the deity of love.* The demon Śambara† carried him off; but he slew the demon.‡

---

assistance, after her kinsmen and friends have been slain in battle, or wounded, and their houses broken open, is the marriage styled *Rákshasa.*" § III., 33.|| According to the Bhágavata, Rukmińí sends to invite Kŕishńa to carry her off, and instructs him how to proceed.

---

* "The deity of love" is to render Madana, a name of Káma or Ananga.

† See Vol. II., p. 70.

‡ जहार शम्बरो यं वै यो जघान च शम्बरम् ।

§ This is from the translation of Sir William Jones.

|| हत्वा च्छित्त्वा च भित्त्वा च क्रोशन्तीं रुदतीं गृहात् ।
प्रसह्य कन्याहरणं राक्षसो विधिरुच्यते ॥

CHAPTER XXVII.

Pradyumna stolen by Śambara; thrown into the sea, and swallowed by a fish; found by Máyádeví: he kills Śambara, marries Máyádeví, and returns, with her, to Dwáraká. Joy of Rukmińí and Kŕishńa.

MAITREYA.—How, Muni, happened it that the hero Pradyumna was carried away by Śambara? And in what manner was the mighty Śambara killed by Pradyumna?

PARÁŚARA.—When Pradyumna was but six days old, he was stolen, from the lying-in chamber, by Śambara, terrible as death;* for the demon foreknew that Pradyumna, if he lived, would be his destroyer.† Taking away the boy, Śambara cast him into the ocean, swarming with monsters,‡—into a whirlpool of roaring waves, the haunt of the huge creatures of the deep.§ A large fish swallowed the child; but he died not, and was born anew, from its belly:[1]|| for that fish,

---

[1] The Bhágavata tells the story in the same manner; but the Hari Vaḿśa omits the part of the fish.

---

* Here, as below, the original has *kálaśambara*, *i. e.*, according to Ratnagarbha, "black Śambara", or "Śambara, equal to death." Śrídhara gives only the latter interpretation.

† षष्ठेऽह्नि जातमात्रं तु प्रद्युम्नं सूतिकागृहात् ।
ममैष हन्तेति मुने हृतवान्कालशम्बरः ॥

‡ *Gráhogra.*

§ कल्लोलजनितावर्ते सुघोरे मकरालये ।

|| पतितं तत्र चैवैको मत्स्यो जग्राह बालकम् ।
न ममार च तस्यापि जठरेण न जीर्यते ॥

with others, was caught by the fishermen, and delivered, by them, to the great Asura Śambara. His wife Máyádeví, the mistress of his household, superintended the operations of the cooks, and saw, when the fish was cut open, a beautiful child, looking like a new shoot of the blighted tree of love. Whilst wondering who this should be, and how he could have got into the belly of the fish, Nárada came, to satisfy her curiosity, and said to the graceful dame: "This is the son of him by whom the whole world is created and destroyed,* —the son of Vishńu, who was stolen, by Śambara, from the lying-in chamber, and tossed (by him,) into the sea, where he was swallowed by the fish. He is now in thy power. Do thou, beautiful woman, tenderly† rear this jewel of mankind." Thus counselled by Nárada, Máyádeví took charge of the boy, and carefully reared him, from childhood, being fascinated by the beauty of his person. Her affection became still more impassioned, when he was decorated with the bloom of adolescence. The gracefully-moving‡ Máyávatí,§ then, fixing her heart and eyes upon the high-minded Pradyumna, gave him, whom she regarded as herself, all her magic (and illusive) powers.||

So reads Śrídhara. Ratnagarbha ends the second verse with जठरानलद्दीपितः; several MSS. unaccompanied by commentary, with जठरेऽनलद्दीपितः।

* समस्तजगतः सूतिसंहारकारिणः। † विस्रब्धा।

‡ *Gajá-gámini*; literally, "having the gait of an elephant."

§ Another name of Máyádeví. Some MSS. yield, here and elsewhere, Máyárati.

|| मायावती ददौ चास्मै मायाः सर्वा महात्मने।
प्रद्युम्नायात्मभूताय तन्न्यस्तहृदयेक्षणा॥

Observing these marks of passionate affection, the son of Kŕishńa* said to the lotos-eyed (Máyádeví): "Why do you indulge in feelings so unbecoming the character of a mother?" To which she replied: "Thou art not a son of mine; thou art the son of Vishńu, whom Kála Śambara† carried away, and threw into the sea. Thou wast swallowed by a fish, but wast rescued, by me, from its belly.‡ Thy fond mother, O beloved, is still weeping for thee." When the valiant§ Pradyumna heard this, he was filled with wrath, and defied Śambara to battle. In the conflict that ensued, the son of Mádhava|| slew the whole host of Śambara. Seven times he foiled the delusions of the enchanter, and, making himself master of the eighth, turned it against Śambara,¶ and killed him. By the same faculty he ascended into the air,** and proceeded to his father's house, where he alighted, along with Máyávatí, in the inner apartments. When the women beheld Pradyumna, they thought it was Kŕishńa himself. Rukmińí, her eyes dimmed with tears, spoke tenderly to him, and said: "Happy is she who has a son like this, in the bloom of youth. Such would be the age

---

This is the reading of Ratnagarbha. Śrídhara begins the second verse with the words प्रद्युम्नायातिरागान्धा।

* Kárshńi, in the original.

† See note * in p. 73, *supra*.

‡ क्षिप्तः समुद्रे मत्स्यस्य संप्राप्तो जठरान्मया।

§ *Mahá-bala.*

|| Mádhavi, in the Sanskrit.

¶ Here the original again has *kála-śambara*.

** In the original there is only the word उत्पत्य, to denote this procedure. Neither of the commentators remarks on the passage. See Vol. III., p. 311, note ||.

of my son Pradyumna, if he was alive. Who is the fortunate mother adorned by thee? And yet, from thy appearance, and from the affection I feel for thee, thou art, assuredly, the son of Hari."

At this moment, Kŕishńa, accompanied by Nárada, arrived; and the latter said to the delighted Rukmińí:* "This is thine own son, who has come hither, after killing Śambara, by whom, when an infant, he was stolen from the lying-in chamber. This is the virtuous Máyávatí, his wife, and not the wife of Śambara. Hear the reason. When Manmatha (the deity of love,) had perished,[1] the goddess of beauty,† desirous to secure his revival, assumed a delusive form, and, by her charms, fascinated the demon Śambara, and exhibited herself to him in various illusory enjoyments.‡ This

---

[1] When he was reduced to ashes by a fiery glance from Śiva, in resentment of his inflaming him with passion for Umá. This legend is a favourite with the Śaiva Puráńas, and is told in the Linga and Káliká; also, in the Padma Puráńa, and Káśí Khańda of the Skanda Puráńa. They do not say much about his resuscitation, however; Śiva, in pity of Rati's grief, restoring him only to a bodiless existence, as Ananga, whose place is to be in the hearts of men. The Linga adds, that, when Vishńu, in consequence of the curse of Bhŕigu, shall be born as the son of Vasudeva, Káma shall be born as one of his sons.

---

* अन्तःपुरचरीं देवीं रुक्मिणी प्राह हर्षयन् ।

I find no variants of this passage.

† This expression is to render *rúpińí*, "the beautiful one,"—an epithet, here, of Rati.

‡ Śrídhara has व्यवायाद्युपभोगेषु । Ratnagarbha, while mentioning this lection, prefers विहाराद्युपभोगेषु; and some MSS. of the mere text exhibit विवाहाद्युपभोगेषु । The Translator seems to have taken the first

thy son is the descended Káma; and this is (the goddess) Rati, his wife.[1] There is no occasion for any uncertainty: this is thy daughter-in-law." Then Rukmińí was glad, and Keśava, also. The whole city resounded with exclamations of joy;* and all the people of Dwáraká† were surprised at Rukmińí's recovering a son who had so long been lost.‡

[1] The daughter of Daksha, but not enumerated amongst those formerly specified (Vol. I., p. 109). She was born from his perspiration, according to the Káliká Puráńa.

of these readings; in which, apparently, he thought he saw वायव्य°, in the sense of something 'airy' or 'unreal'. The whole expression signifies "sexual congress and other enjoyments".

* नगरी च समस्ता सा साधु साध्वित्यभाषत ।

† The original has Dwáravatí.

‡ The rendering of this Chapter deviates rather more widely than usual from literality.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Wives of Kŕishńa. Pradyumna has Aniruddha: nuptials of the latter. Balaráma, beat at dice, becomes incensed, and slays Rukmin and others.

RUKMIŃÍ bare to Kŕishńa these other sons: Chárudeshńa, Sudeshńa, Chárudeha,* Susheńa, Chárugupta, Bhadracháru, Cháruvinda,† Sucháru, and the very mighty Cháru;‡ also, one daughter, Chárumatí. Kŕishńa had seven other beautiful wives:§ Ká-

* *Mahábala*, in one MS., follows Chárudeha. It would be difficult to prove that it is not a proper name.

† Instead of Susheńa and Cháruvinda, the *Bhágavata-puráńa* has Vicháru and Cháruchandra.

‡ A single copy has Chandra.

Several other sons of Rukmińí, elsewhere recognized as such, are here unnoticed. See Vol. IV., p. 112, note **.

§ The original is as follows:

अन्याश्च भार्याः कृष्णस्य बभूवुः सप्त शोभनाः ।

It is signified, by this verse, that seven beautiful wives are about to be named; but it is not expressly said that the specification is restricted to seven wives, or to beautiful ones only. The commentators, however, endeavour to reduce the catalogue to a septenary. Śrídhara's identification, in order to this reduction, is spoken of, by the Translator, in his note in p. 81, *infra*, but is not accepted by him. Further particulars Śrídhara does not enter into; and the Translator, who does not even allude to Ratnagarbha's roll of the ladies, assumes that we are to find, here, precisely the same seven—and no more,—that are enumerated at the beginning of Chapter XXXII. of this Book. But, as will appear from my annotations that follow, it is more or less possible that several wives are designated over and above the heptad with which the commentators content themselves. My Ajmere MS. ends the verse quoted above with बभूवुस्त्वतिशोभनाः; thus premising 'very beautiful' wives, —not simply 'beautiful',—and omitting all definition of their number.

Ratnagarbha asserts that the seven are: Mitravindá, Satyá, Jámbavatí, Rohińí, Suśílá, Satyabhámá, and Lakshmańá; and the words connected with these names are, he pronounces, epithets. Unlike Śrídhara, he

lindí,* Mitravindá,† the virtuous‡ Nágnajití,§ the queen‖ Jámbavatí;¶ Rohińí,** of beautiful form;†† the

---

takes Jámbavatí to be a different person from Rohińí; and he considers Kálindí to be a synonym of Mitravindá.

In Vol. IV., p. 112, we read that Kríshńa's principal wives "were Rukmińí, Satyabhámá, Jámbavatí, Chárubásiní, and four others." If we knew who these four others were, it could be ascertained how far the principal wives tallied with the beautiful ones, and whether the group under discussion contains additions to those two categories.

* For her origin, see Vol. IV., p. 286, note *. Her offspring, as named in the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, were Śruta, Kavi, Vŕisha, Víra, Subáhu, Bhadra, Śánti, Darśa, Púrńamása, and Somaka.

† Corrected from "Mitravŕindá", which I find nowhere but in a carelessly executed copy of Śrídhara's text and commentary, to which Professor Wilson was very partial, and which he too often used without controlling it.

Mitravindá's children, the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, alleges, were ten: Vŕika, Harsha, Anila, Gŕidhra, Vardhana, Annáda, Mahása, Pávana, Vahni, and Kshudhi.

‡ The original is सत्या नाग्नजिती तथा। According to Śrídhara, in his commentary on the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, the lady here intended is Satyá, patronymically called Nágnajití. For the Translator's "the virtuous Nágnajití", we should, therefore, read 'Satyá, daughter of Nagnajit.' M. Langlois makes the same mistake, in his translation of the *Harivaḿśa*, Vol. I., p. 500. See further, note § in the preceding page, and note ‡‡ in p. 82, *infra*.

§ Mother, the *Bhágavata-puráńa* alleges, of Víra, Chandra, Aśwasena, Chitragu, Vegavat, Vŕisha, Áma, Śanku, Vasu, and Kunti.

‖ देवी जाम्बवती चापि। It is barely possible that we should read 'Deví,' not "the queen". Compare the *Harivaḿśa*, *śl.* 9179.

For Jámbavatí, see Vol. IV., p. 79.

¶ The *Bhágavata-puráńa* represents her as mother of Sámba, Sumitra, Purujit, Śatajit, Sahasrajit, Vijaya, Chitraketu, Vasumat, Dravida, and Kratu.

** An elder Rohińí was one of Kríshńa's numerous step-mothers. See Vol. IV., pp. 109 and 260.

Kríshńa's wife Rohińí had, on the authority of the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, the following sons: Váma, Áyus, Satyaka, Díptimat, Támratapta, and others unnamed.

†† कामरूपिणी। Possibly, this is a proper name, Kámarúpiní; but, probably, it is an epithet. See the *Harivaḿśa*, *śl.* 6701.

amiable and excellent daughter of the king of Madra,*

---

* *Madrarája.* Leaving out of question the interpretation "king of Madra", our choice lies, according to circumstances, between "king of the Madras" and "King Madra." In the purest Sanskrit, only the former of these two significations is admissible. There are many cases, in later literature, similar to *Madrarája*, thus considered; such as *Káśirája*, *Vatsarája*, *Bhojarája*, *Bhojapati*, &c. &c. Instances in which there is not the option spoken of above, but in which, at variance with classical canons, substantival members of a compound stand in apposition, are *Varadarája*, *Bhojadeva*, *Kámadeva*, *Mádhavadeva*, *Nandíśa*, *Venkaťeśa*, *Bháilleśa*, *Kapileśwara*, *Rámeśwara*, *Gorakshanátha*, *Śeshanága*, *Aghásura*, &c. &c.

Mádrí's father might, as has been said, be *Madrarája* in the sense of "King Madra"; only no such ruler has been discovered among Kŕishńa's contemporaries. Conclusively, Lakshmańá—as the lady who bears the patronym of Mádrí is distinctively called,—is said, in the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, to have been daughter of *Madrádhipati*, which it would be very unsafe to translate otherwise than by "king of the Madras".

In Sanskrit, names of countries and kingdoms are denoted, very frequently, by compounds ending with a word for country or kingdom,—*deśa*, *vishaya*, *rájya*, *rásht́ra*. Examples of such names standing independently are rare, and seem to be confined to feminines. Most generally, a plural is employed; and this plural imports a people. Thus, where we should be disposed to say "he lives in Málava", an ancient Hindu would have said "he lives in the country of the Málavas", वसति मालवदेशे, or, in accordance with the somewhat more prevalent idiom, "he lives among the Málavas", वसति मालवेषु.

The preponderant usage here referred to may, perhaps, be accounted for in this wise. The earliest Hindus were grouped in tribes, not in nations; and these tribes were distinguished by lineage, not by place of abode. The titles which they bore were eponymous; and it should seem that they were long in acquiring fixed habitations. Hence, it may be surmised,—and not for the reason that led Louis Philippe to style himself "king of the French",—it is that we read of, for instance, "the king of the Panchálas"; somewhat as, from a sense of vagueness, the Yavanas, Húńas, Chínas, Turushkas, and Śakas were never localized, further than by the indeterminate forms *Yavana-deśa*, "country of the Yavanas," and the like. In later times, as history informs us, kingdoms of more or less definite bounds were established, and lasted for long periods. But the old idiom had become so firmly rooted as, in spite of the altered state of things, to hold its ground; and the option of mentioning a region or state (by its simple name), instead of its people, was seldom accepted. The sole exceptions seem to be afforded

(Mádrí);* Satyabhámá,† the daughter of Sattrájita;‡ and Lakshmańá, of lovely smiles.[1]§ Besides these,

---

[1] The number specified, however, both in this place and in Chapter XXXII., is nine, instead of eight. The commentator || endeavours to explain the difference, by identifying Rohińí with Jámbavatí. But, in the notices of Křishńa's posterity, both in

---

by the names of cities which were, of themselves, kingdoms; and most Hindu cities bore appellations of the feminine gender. The Kurukshetra, Mashńára, Sáchiguńa, and Avachatnuka of the *Aitareya-bráhmańa* I take to be cities with masculine names,—like Kanyakubja, &c.,—not countries.

If this view be not fallacious, we can, therefore, only plead convenience, when we speak of Abhíra, Ánarta, Chedi, Kerala, Kosala, Kuru, Madra, Magadha, Málava, Śúrasena, &c. &c., after the manner of the latest and most corrupt Sanskrit, and of the living vernaculars of India. Similarly, we find, in Latin, only *Sabinorum ager* or *Sabinus ager*, and *in Sabinis versari, in Sabinos proficisci*; but, in the present day, we have *la Sabina*. The Greeks, it is true, devised the name Σαβίνη; and, in the same way, they invented the names Abiria, Cirrhadia, Gandaritis, *etc.*, though the ancient Hindus recognized no countries denominated Abhíra, Kiráta, Gandhára, &c.

* I have parenthesized this name, as being added by the Translator. The original has सुशीला शीलमण्डना। The latter word is, palpably, an epithet of the former, and suggested thereby. The *Harivaḿśa*, *śl.* 6700, places this point beyond all doubt. We must read, therefore, "Suśílá," and eliminate "amiable and excellent". *Vide supra*, p. 78, note §. Suśílá appears, in p. 107, *infra*, under her patronym Mádrí.

To Mádrí the *Bhágavata-puráńa* assigns progeny bearing the names of Praghosha, Gátravat, Siḿha, Bala, Prabala, Úrdhwaga, Maháśakti, Saha, Oja, and Parájita.

† According to the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, she had ten children: Bhánu, Subhánu, Swarbhánu, Prabhánu, Bhánumat, Chandrabhánu, Břihadbhánu, Atibhánu, Śríbhánu, and Pratibhánu.

‡ Corrected from "Śatrujit". The original has Sáttrájití, patronymic of Sattrájita, for whom and his daughter Satyabhámá, see Vol. IV., pp. 79, 80.

§ चारुहासिनी। Here we have, possibly, another name of Lakshmańá, rather than an epithet. For Chárubásiní, see Vol. IV., p. 112, note ||. Also see note § in p. 83, *infra*. My Ajmere MS. gives प्रियदर्शना; and Priyadarśaná, too, is a lady's name, as in my *Vásavadattá*, p. 236.

|| Śrídhara is intended. *Vide supra*, p. 78, note §.

he* had sixteen thousand other wives.[1] †

this work and in the Bhágavata, she is distinct from Jámbavatí. She seems, however, to be an addition to the more usually specified eight, of whose several marriages the Bhágavata gives the best account. In addition to the three first, — respecting whom particulars are found in all,—Kálindí, or the Yamuná,‡ is the daughter of the Sun, whom Kŕishńa meets on one of his visits to Indraprastha, § and who claims him as the reward of her penance. His next wife, Mitravindá, is the daughter of his maternal aunt, Rájádhideví (Vol. IV., pp. 101 and 103), and sister of Vinda and Anuvinda, kings of Avantí: || she chooses him at her Swayaṁvara. The Hari Vaṁśa ¶ calls her Sudattá,** daughter of Śibi; and she is, subsequently, termed Śaibyá by our text. †† Nágnajití, or Satyá, ‡‡ the next wife, was the daughter of Nagnajit, king of Kauśala, §§ and was the prize of Kŕishńa's overcoming seven fierce bulls, whom no other hero had encountered with success. Bhadrá, |||| princess of Kekaya, ¶¶—also Kŕishńa's cousin, the daughter of Śrutakírtti (Vol. IV., pp. 101 and 103), — was his next; and his eighth wife was Mádrí, *** the daughter of the

* Chakrin, in the original.

† In all, Kŕishńa's wives amounted to sixteen thousand and one hundred, as we read in Vol. IV., p. 112. But *vide infra*, p. 105, note §§.

‡ See Vol. III., p. 20.

§ A city on the Jumna, near the present Delhi. It belonged to the Páńdavas.

|| See Vol. IV., supplementary note on p. 103.

¶ *Śl.* 9179 and 9187. In *śl.* 6703 of the same work, this or another daughter of Śibi seems to be called Tanwí.

** Corrected from "Saudattá". See note || in the page following.

†† In p. 107, *infra*.

‡‡ Transformed, in the text, into "the virtuous". See note ‡ in p. 79, *supra*.

§§ The *Bhágavata-puráńa* describes Nagnajit as *Kausalya*, which Śrídhara interprets by *Ayodhyá-pati*, "King of Ayodhyá"; and this city was the capital of Kosala.

|||| Her children, we read in the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, were Sangrámajit, Bŕihatsena, Śúra, Praharańa, Arijit, Jaya, and Subhadra.

¶¶ See Vol. IV., p. 103, text and note §. The *Bhágavata-puráńa* simply gives Bhadrá the epithet Kaikeyí.

*** See note * in the last page.

The heroic Pradyumna was chosen, for her lord, at her public choice of a husband, by the daughter of Rukmin;* and he had, by her, the powerful and gallant prince Aniruddha, who was fierce in fight,† an ocean of prowess, and the tamer of his foes. Keśava demanded, in marriage, for him, the granddaughter of

---

king of Madra,‡—named, according to the Bhágavata, Lakshmańá,§ and, to the Hari Vaḿśa, Subhímá;|| distinguishing, as does our text, clearly, Lakshmańá from Mádrí, and, like it, having no satisfactory equivalent for Bhadrá. The Hari Vaḿśa does not name Rohińí, but specifies other names, as Bŕihatí,¶ &c. In the life of Kŕishńa—taken from the Bhágavata, through a Persian translation,—published by Maurice, there is a curious instance of the barbarous distortion of Sanskrit names by the joint labours of the English and Persian translators. The wives of Kŕishńa are written: Rokemenee (Rukmińí), Setubhavani (Satyabhámá), Jamoometee (Jámbavatí), Kalenderee (Kálindí), Lechmeena (Lakshmańá), Soeta (Satyá), Bhedravatee (Bhadrá), Mihabenda (Mitravindá).

[1] These, according to the Mahábhárata, Ádi Parvan, were Apsarasas, or nymphs. In the Dána Dharma, they become Kŕishńa's wives through a boon given him by Umá.

---

* Kakudmatí was her name. See Vol. IV., p. 112, text and note ††. The *Bhágavata-puráńa* calls her Rukmavatí, also. For Rukmin, *vide supra*, p. 67.

† रणे क्रुद्धः ।

‡ *Vide supra*, p. 80, note *.

§ Corrected from "Lakshańá". *Vide supra*, p. 80, note *. In the *Harivaḿśa*, *śl.* 6702 and 9179, Lakshmańá takes the place of Mádrí, and is followed, according to the Calcutta and Bombay editions, by जालहासिनी, for which see Vol. IV., p. 112, note ||. Is it a third synonym? *Vide supra*, p. 81, note §.

|| Corrected from "Saubhímá". See the *Harivaḿśa*, *śl.* 9180.

Professor Wilson's "Saudattá" and "Saubhimá" were taken, I suspect, from the "Soudattâ" and "Soubhîmâ" of M. Langlois; his *ou*, a translettering of उ, *u*, being supposed to represent औ, *au*.

¶ Daughter of Śibi. *Harivaḿśa*, *śl.* 9192.

Rukmin; and, although the latter was inimical to Kŕishńa,* he betrothed the maiden† (who was his son's daughter,) to the son of his own daughter (her cousin Aniruddha). Upon the occasion of the nuptials, Ráma and other Yádavas attended Kŕishńa‡ to Bhojakaťa, the city of Rukmin. After the wedding§ had been solemnized, several of the kings, headed by him of Kalinga,|| said to Rukmin: "This wielder of the ploughshare¶ is ignorant of the dice, which may be converted into his misfortune. Why may we not contend with him, and beat him, in play?"** The potent Rukmin replied to them, and said "So let it be." And he engaged Balaráma†† at a game of dice, in the palace. Balaráma‡‡ soon lost to Rukmin a thousand Nishkas.[1] He then staked and lost another thousand,

[1] The Nishka is a weight of gold, but, according to different authorities, of very different amount. The commentator§§ here terms it a weight of four Suvarńas, each about 175 grains Troy. ||||

---

* Śauri, in the original.

† Subhadrá. See Vol. IV., p. 112.

‡ The Sanskrit has Hari.

§ Of Prádyumni,—according to the original,—that is to say, Aniruddha.

|| कलिङ्गराजप्रमुखाः, "the king of Kalinga, and others."

¶ Halin, *i. e.*, Balaráma. *Vide supra*, p. 63, note ||, and p. 65, note ‡‡.

** अनक्षज्ञो हली द्यूते तथास्य व्यसनं महत् ।
न जयामो बलं कस्माद्द्यूतेनैनं महाद्युते ॥

Ratnagarbha has अनभिज्ञः instead of अनक्षज्ञः ।

†† Ráma, in the original.

‡‡ The Sanskrit has Bala.

§§ Śrídhara. Ratnagarbha is silent.

|||| In reckoning money by tale, the *nishka*, according to the first chapter of the *Lilávati*, is equivalent to sixteen *drammas*. See Colebrooke's *Algebra*, &c., p. 1.

and then pledged ten thousand, which Rukmin, who was well skilled in gambling, also won. At this, the king of Kalinga laughed aloud;* and the weak and exulting Rukmin grinned, and said:† Baladeva is losing; for he knows nothing of the game; although, blinded by a vain passion for play, he thinks he understands the dice."‡ Haláyudha, galled by the broad laughter of the Kalinga prince,§ and the contemptuous speech of Rukmin, was (exceedingly) angry, and, overcome with passion, increased his stake to ten millions of Nishkas. Rukmin accepted the challenge, and, therefore, threw the dice. Baladeva won, and cried aloud "The stake is mine." But Rukmin called out, as loudly, that he was the winner. "Tell no lies, Bala,"|| said he. "The stake is yours; that is true: but I did not agree to it. Although this be won by you, yet still I am the winner."¶ A deep voice was then heard in the sky,—inflaming still more the anger of the high-spirited Baladeva,—saying: "Bala has rightly won the whole sum, and Rukmin speaks falsely. Although he did not accept the pledge in words, he did so by his acts,** (having cast the dice)." Bala-

---

* *Swanavat.*

† दन्तान्विदर्शयन्मूढो रुक्मी चाह मदोद्धतः ।

‡ मुधैवाक्षावलेपान्धो यः स्वं मेनेऽक्षकोविदम् ।

So read most MSS., and Srídhara. Ratnagarbha has:

मुधैवाक्षावलेपान्धो योऽवमेनेऽक्षकोविदान् ।

§ दृष्ट्वा कलिङ्गराजानं प्रकाशदशनाननम् ।

|| अलीकोक्तैरलं बल: "Have done with lies, Bala."

¶ एवं त्वया चेद्विजितं मया न विजितं कथम् ।

** The expression in the original looks proverbial:

अनुक्त्वापि वचः किंचित्कृतं भवति कर्मणा ।

ráma,* thus excited, his eyes red with rage, started up, and struck Rukmin with the board on which the game was played,† and killed him.[1] Taking hold of the trembling king of Kalinga, he knocked out the teeth which he had shown when he laughed.‡ Laying hold of a golden column, he dragged it from its place, and used it as a weapon to kill those princes who had taken part with his adversaries.§ Upon which, the whole circle, crying out with terror, took to flight, and escaped from the wrath of Baladeva.|| When Kŕishńa¶ heard that Rukmin had been killed by his brother, he made no remark, being afraid of Rukmińí (on the one hand,) and of Bala (on the other); but, taking with him the (newly) wedded Aniruddha, and the Yádava tribe, he** returned to Dwáraká.

---

[1] The Bhágavata and Hari Vaḿśa—which, both, tell this story,—agree in the death of Rukmin; but, in the Mahábhárata, he appears, in the war, on the side of the Pańdavas. The occurrence is a not very favourable picture of courtly manners; but scenes of violence have never been infrequent at the courts of Rajpoot princes.

---

* The Sanskrit has Bala.

† *Ashtápada.*

‡ See the original words quoted in note § in the preceding page.

§ आकृष्य च महास्तम्भं जातरूपमयं बलः ।
जघान येऽन्ये तत्पक्षा भूभृतः कुपितो बलात् ॥

|| ततो हाहाकृतं सर्वं पलायनपरं द्विज ।
तद्राजमण्डलं सर्वं बभूव कुपिते बले ॥

¶ Madhusúdana, in the original.

** Keśava, according to the reading accepted by Śrídhara. The other, Ratnagarbha's lection, represents Bala as leading off Keśava and the rest.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Indra comes to Dwáraká, and reports to Kŕishńa the tyranny of Naraka. Kŕishńa goes to his city, and puts him to death. Earth gives the ear-rings of Aditi to Kŕishńa, and praises him. He liberates the princesses made captive by Naraka, sends them to Dwáraká, and goes to Swarga, with Satyabhámá.

ŚAKRA,* the lord of the three worlds, came mounted on his fierce† (elephant,) Airávata, to (visit) Śauri (Kŕishńa,) at Dwáraká.‡ Having entered the city, and been welcomed by Hari, he related (to the hero) the deeds of the demon§ Naraka.|| "By thee, Madhusúdana, lord of the gods," said Indra, "in a mortal condition, all sufferings have been soothed. Arishťa, Dhenuka, Cháńúra, Mushťika,¶ Keśin, who sought to injure helpless man,** have, all, been slain by thee. Kaḿsa, Kuvalayápíďa, the child-destroying Pútaná, have been killed by thee; and so have other oppressors of the world. By thy valour and wisdom

---

* Or Indra. For him and his mother, see Vol. II., p. 27. Śakra and Hari were, both, sons of Aditi. See Vol. I., p. 151; and Vol. III., p. 18, text and notes 1 and †.

† *Matta.*

‡ Dwáravatí, in the original.

§ Daitya. See the next note.

|| The less famous Naraka was son of Viprachitti, son of Kaśyapa and Danu, and, hence, was a Dánava, according to our Puráńa. See Vol. II., pp. 70—72. The Naraka of the text was not a Dánava; nor can he be called a Daitya, except by a very loose use of the term. As appears from note 1 in the next page, his father was Vishńu; and our text expresses that his mother was Bhúmi.

¶ Ratnagarbha's text does not mention the two pancratiasts Cháńúra and Mushťika.

** *Tapaswi-jana.*

the three worlds have been preserved;* and the gods, obtaining their share of the sacrifices offered by the devout, enjoy satisfaction. But now hear the occasion on which I have come to thee, and which thou art able to remedy.† The son of the earth,[1] ‡ called Naraka, who rules over the city of Prágjyotisha,[2] § inflicts a great injury upon all creatures. Carrying off the maidens of gods, saints,|| demons, and kings, he shuts them up in his own palace.¶ He has taken away the umbrella of Varuńa,** impermeable to water, the jewel-mountain crest of Mandara,†† and the celestial nectar-dropping ear-rings of my mother‡‡ Aditi;§§ and

---

[1] By Vishńu, as the Varáha Avatára;|||| but found and adopted by Janaka. Káliká Puráńa.

[2] In the centre of the country of Kámarúpa,¶¶ inhabited by Kirátas; the site of the shrines of Deví, as Dikkaravásiní and Kámákhyá.*** Káliká Puráńa.

---

* युष्मद्दोर्दण्डसद्बुद्धिपरित्राते जगत्त्रये ।

† सोऽहं साम्प्रतमायातो यन्निमित्तं जनार्दन ।
तच्छ्रुत्वा तत्प्रतीकारप्रयत्नं कर्तुमर्हसि ॥

‡ *Bhauma.*

§ The original does not make him ruler over that city, but simply says that it was the scene of his cruelties.

For Prágjyotisha, *vide supra*, p. 55, note ‡.

|| *Siddha.*

¶ *Mandira.*

** Called Prachetas, in the Sanskrit.

†† See Vol. II., p. 115.

‡‡ See note * in the preceding page.

§§ Corrected, here and everywhere below, from "Aditi".

|||| See Vol. I., p. 61, note 2, *ad finem.*

¶¶ *Vide supra*, p. 54, note 2.

*** In Assam, according to Professor Wilson, in his collected Works, Vol. III., p. 77. Also see Vol. I., Preface, p. XC. of the present work, where correct "Kámákshyá".

he now demands my elephant, Airávata.* I have, thus, explained to you, Govinda, the tyranny of the Asura. You can best determine how it is to be prevented."†

Having heard this account, the divine Hari‡ (gently) smiled, and, rising from his throne,§ took Indra|| by the hand. Then, wishing for the eater of the serpents, Garuda immediately appeared; upon whom his master, having first seated Satyabhámá upon his back, ascended, and flew to Prágjyotisha. Indra¶ mounted his elephant, and, in the sight of the inhabitants of Dwáraká, went to the abode of the gods.

The environs of Prágjyotisha were defended by nooses, constructed by the demon Muru,** the edges of which were as sharp as razors;†† but Hari, throwing his discus Sudarśana‡‡ (amongst them), cut them to pieces. Then Muru started up; but Keśava slew him,

---

* अमृतस्राविणी दिव्ये मन्मातुः कृष्ण कुण्डले ।
जहार सोऽसुरोऽदित्या वाञ्छत्यैरावतं गजम् ॥

So reads Śrídhara. Ratnagarbha has, for the first verse:

अमृतस्राविणी दिव्ये मणिनिर्मितकुण्डले ।

Some MSS., further, deviate from Śrídhara's reading only by नाम्ना ते, instead of मन्मातुः; from which it appears that the ear-rings were called Divya.

† यदत्र प्रतिपत्तव्यं तत्स्वयं प्रविमृश्यताम् ।

‡ "Son of Devaki," after the Sanskrit.

§ *Varásana.*

|| In the original, Vásava.

¶ Śakra, in the Sanskrit.

** *Vide supra*, p. 54, notes 2 and ||, and p. 55, note *.

†† प्राग्ज्योतिषपुरस्यासीत्समन्ताच्छतयोजनम्
आचिता मौरवैः पाशैः क्षुरान्तैर्भूर्द्विजोत्तम ॥

‡‡ We have before had mention of it. See Vol. II., p. 52.

and burnt his* seven thousand sons, like moths,† with the flame of the edge of his discus. Having slain Muru, Hayagríva,‡ and Panchajana,§ the wise Hari rapidly reached|| the city of Prágjyotisha. There a (fierce) conflict took place with the troops of Naraka, in which Govinda destroyed thousands of demons; and, when Naraka came into the field, showering upon the deity all sorts of weapons, the wielder of the discus and annihilator of the demon-tribe cut him in two with his celestial missile.¶ Naraka being slain, Earth,** bearing the two ear-rings of Aditi, approached the lord of the world,†† and said: "When, O lord, I was upheld by thee in the form of a boar, thy contact then engendered this my son. He whom thou gavest me has now been killed by thee. Take (therefore,) these two ear-rings, and cherish his progeny. Thou, lord, whose aspect is (ever) gracious,‡‡ hast come to this sphere, in a portion of thyself, to lighten my burthen. Thou art the eternal§§ creator, preserver,|||| and destroyer

---

* मुरोश्च, or else मुरोस्तु, in the original. The variant of some copies, मुरस्य, substitutes Mura for Muru. These persons—whose names are often confounded in MSS.,—were, both, slain by Kŕishńa. The latter is said, by Śrídhara, to have been a Rákshasa.

† *Śalabha.*

‡ *Vide supra*, p. 2, note ¶.

§ *Vide supra*, p. 48.

|| *Samupádravat*, "assaulted."

¶ शस्त्रास्त्रवर्षं मुञ्चन्तं भौमं तं नरकं बली ।
छित्त्वा चक्रं द्विधा चक्रे चक्री दैतेयचक्रहा ॥

** Bhúmi.

†† *Jagannátha.*

‡‡ प्रसादसुमुखः ।

§§ *Avyaya.* See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.

|||| *Vikartŕi*; 'transformer,' literally: "by means of rain and the like," say the commentators.

of the universe; the origin of all worlds; and one with the universe.* What praise can be worthily offered to thee?† Thou art the pervader, and that which is pervaded; the act, the agent, and the effect; the universal spirit of all beings. What praise can be worthily offered to thee?‡ Thou art the abstract soul, the sentient and the living soul of all beings, the imperishable. But, since it is not possible to praise thee worthily, then why should the hopeless attempt proceed?§ Have compassion, O universal soul, and forgive the sins which Naraka has committed. Verily, it is for the sanctification of thy son, that he has been killed by thee."|| The lord, who is the substance of all creatures,¶ having replied to the Earth** "Even so," proceeded to redeem the (various) gems from the dwelling of Naraka. In the apartments of the women†† he found sixteen thousand and one hundred damsels.[1]

---

[1] These were captive princesses, according to the Bhágavata;

---

* Of this passage there are several different readings, of little consequence.

† स्तूयतेऽच्युत किं तव ।

‡ Here the translation is not literal.

§ परमात्मा त्वमात्मा च भूतात्मा चाव्ययो भवान् ।
यदा तदा स्तुतिर्नास्ति किमर्था ते प्रवर्तते ॥

Ratnagarbha says: नास्तित्वमेवाह । किमर्था । किमाश्रया ।
For the expressions *paramátman*, *átman*, and *bhútátman*, here employed, *vide supra*, p. 14, note ††.

|| अदोषाय त्वत्सुतः स निपातितः । So reads Śridhara; and his explanation has been followed by the Translator. Ratnagarbha speaks of this lection, but prefers to end the verse with तत्सूतिः परिपाल्यतां ; in accepting which he connects अदोषाय with क्षम्यतां, which precedes it.

¶ *Bhúta-bhávana*, "creator of beings."

** Dharańi.

†† *Kanyá-pura.*

He also beheld (in the palace,) six thousand large* elephants,† each having four tusks; twenty-one lakhs‡ of horses of Kámboja§ and other excellent breeds.|| These¶ Govinda despatched to Dwáraká, in charge of the servants of Naraka. The umbrella of Varuṅa, the jewel-mountain, which he also recovered, he placed upon Garuḋa;** and, mounting him, himself, and taking Satyabhámá with him, he set off to the heaven of the gods, to restore the ear-rings of Aditi.[1]

Apsarasas, or celestial nymphs, according to the Káliká Puráṅa; and these, upon their rescue by Kṙishṅa, became his wives.††

[1] The legend of Naraka is related, in more detail, in the Bhágavata and Hari Vaṁśa, but is still more fully narrated in the Káliká Upapuráṅa. It may be considered as one of the various intimations that occur in the Puráṅas, of hostilities between the worshippers of Vishṅu and Śiva; Naraka being, in an especial degree, favoured by the latter.

---

* *Ugra.*

† According to the reading of some MSS., there were as many horses,—common ones, it is to be supposed, since a particular kind is specified just below.

‡ *Niyuta*; a term variously defined by different authorities. See notes on the beginning of Chapter III. of Book VI.

§ काम्बोजानाम् । For the Kámbojas, see Vol. III., p. 291, note 1.

|| I find nothing, in the original, answering to the words "and other excellent breeds".

¶ That is to say, agreeably to the original, the girls, the elephants, and the horses.

** ददृशे वारुणं छत्रं तथैव मणिपर्वतम् ।
आरोपयामास हरिर्गरुडे पन्नगाशने ॥

I find no variants of this stanza, save as to its closing word, which Ratnagarbha reads पतगेश्वरे ।

†† According to the text of our Puráṅa, also, Kṙishṅa married them. *Vide infra*, p. 105.

CHAPTER XXX.

Kŕishńa restores her ear-rings to Aditi, and is praised by her: he visits the gardens of Indra, and, at the desire of Satyabhámá, carries off the Párijáta-tree. Śachí excites Indra to its rescue. Conflict between the gods and Kŕishńa, who defeats them. Satyabhámá derides them. They praise Kŕishńa.

GARUD́A, laden with the umbrella of Varuńa, and the jewel-mountain, and bearing Hŕishíkeśa* (on his back, to the court of Indra), went (lightly), as if in sport, along. When they arrived at the portals of Swarga, Hari blew his shell; on which the gods advanced to meet him, bearing respectful offerings.† Having received the homage of the divinities, Kŕishńa went to the palace of the mother of the gods, whose turrets‡ resembled white clouds; and, on beholding Aditi, paid his respects to her, along with Śakra; and, presenting to her her own ear-rings, informed her of the destruction of (the demon) Naraka. The mother of the world, well pleased, then fixed her whole thoughts upon Hari, the creator, and thus pronounced his praise: "Glory to thee, O god with the lotos-eyes, who removest all fear from those that worship thee. Thou art the eternal, universal, and living soul; the origin of all beings;§ the instigator of the mental fac-

---

* "And his wife:" सभार्यं च हृषीकेशम् । For Hŕishíkeśa, see Vol. I., p. 2, note 1.

† सार्घपात्राः ।

‡ *Śikhara.*

§ सनातनात्मन्सर्वात्मन्भूतात्मन्भूतभावन ।

ulty and faculties of sense;* one with the three qualities; beyond the three qualities; exempt from contraries; pure; existing in the hearts of all; void of colour, extension, and every transient modification;† unaffected by (the vicissitudes of) birth, or death, sleep, or waking. Thou art evening,‡ night, and day; earth, sky, air, water, and fire; mind, intellect, and individuality.§ Thou art the agent of creation, duration, and dissolution; the master over the agent;—in thy forms which are called Brahmá, Vishńu, and Śiva. Thou art gods, Yakshas, Daityas, Rákshasas, Siddhas, Pannagas,|| Kúshmáńdas, Piśáchas, Gandharvas, men, animals,¶ deer,** elephants, reptiles,†† trees, shrubs, creepers,‡‡ climbers,§§ and grasses;|||| all things large, middling, small, immense, or minute: thou art all bodies whatsoever, composed of aggregated atoms.¶¶ This thy illusion beguiles all who are ignorant of thy true nature,—the fools who imagine soul to be in that

---

* प्रणेता मनसो बुद्धेरिन्द्रियाणाम् ।

† सितदीर्घादिनिःशेषकल्पनापरिवर्जित ।

‡ *Sandhyá.*

§ भूतादिः । Ratnagarbha explains it by *ahaṁkára.* For *bhútádi,* see Vol. I., p. 33, note *.

|| Corrected from "Punnagas". *Pannaga* is the same as *sarpa,* for which see Vol. I., p. 83. The next term, "Kúshmáńdas," is rendered "goblins" in Vol. IV., p. 277.

¶ *Paśu;* "sacrificial animals." *Vide supra,* p. 59, note **.

** *Mŕiga,* "wild beasts."

†† *Sarisŕipa.* See Vol. I., p. 84, note §; and Vol. II., p. 92, text and note §.

‡‡ *Latá.*

§§ *Vallí.*

|||| For similar enumerations, see Vol. I., p. 84; and Vol. II., p. 92.

¶¶ देहभेदा भवान्सर्वे ये केचित्पुद्गलाश्रयाः ।

which is not spirit.* The notions that "I am—this is mine", which influence mankind, are but the delusions of the mother of the world, originating in thy active agency.† Those men who, attentive to their duties, diligently worship thee, traverse all this illusion, and obtain spiritual freedom. Brahmá and all the gods, men, and animals,‡ are, alike, invested by the thick darkness of fascination, in the gulf of the illusions of Vishńu. That men who, having worshipped thee, should seek the gratification of their desires, and their own preservation,—this, O lord, is, also, thy delusion. It is the sport of thy fascinations that induces men to glorify thee, to obtain, thereby, the continuance of their race, or the annihilation of their enemies, instead of eternal liberation.§ It is the fault of the impure acts of the unrighteous (to proffer such idle requests to one able to confer much more important benefits),—like asking for a rag to cover one's nakedness|| from the tree that bestows whatever is solicited.¶ Be propitious,

---

* माया तवेयमज्ञातपरमार्थातिमोहिनी ।
अनात्मन्यात्मविज्ञानं यया मूढोऽनुरुध्यते ॥

At the end of the second verse, in lieu of अनुरुध्यते, the reading of Śrídhara, Ratnagarbha has अनुबध्यते. Another lection which I find is निबध्यते ।

† अहं ममेति भावोऽत्र यत्पुंसामभिजायते ।
संसारमातुर्मायायास्तवैतन्नाथ चेष्टितम् ॥

‡ *Paśu.*

§ आराध्य त्वामभीप्सन्ते कामानात्मभवक्षयम् ।
यदेते पुरुषा माया सैवेयं भगवंस्तव ॥
मया त्वं पुत्रकामिन्या वैरिपक्षक्षयाय च ।
आराधितो न मोक्षाय मायाविलसितं हि तत् ॥

|| *Kaupina.*

¶ *Kalpadruma.*

then, imperishable, author of all the error that deceives the world; and dispel, O lord of all creatures, the conceit of knowledge, which proceeds from ignorance.* Glory to thee, grasper of the discus, wielder of the bow, brandisher of the mace, holder of the shell! For such do I behold thee, in thy perceptible form. Nor do I know that form of thine which is beyond perception. Have compassion on me, supreme god."†

Vishńu, thus hymned by Aditi, smiled, and said to the mother of the gods:‡ "Mother, goddess, do thou show favour unto me, and grant me thy blessing."§ "So be it," replied Aditi, "even|| as thou wilt; and, (whilst thou dwellest) amongst mortals, the first of men,¶ thou shalt be invincible by gods or demons." Then Satyabhámá, accompanied by the queen of Indra,** addressed Aditi respectfully, and solicited her benedictions; and Aditi (in reply,) said to her: "Fair-browed dame, thou shalt never suffer decay, nor loss of beauty. Thou shalt be the asylum of all loveliness, dame of

---

* अज्ञानं ज्ञानसद्भावभूतं भूतेश नाशय ।

Ratnagarbha says: ज्ञानसद्भावभूतम् । ज्ञानवानहमित्यभिमानात्मकम् । And Śrídhara comments to precisely the same effect.

† एतत्पश्यामि ते रूपं स्थूलचिह्नोपलक्षितम् ॥
न जानामि परं यत्ते प्रसीद परमेश्वर ॥

‡ *Suráraní.* Similarly, Kuntí is called *Páńdaváraní,* in the *Mahábhárata.*

For *araní,* see Vol. III., p. 330, note *.

§ वरदा भव ।

|| Corrected from "ever",—a typographical error. The original is यथेच्छा ते ।

¶ *Purusha-vyághra,* 'tiger of a man,' and in the vocative. See Vol. IV., p. 320, note ¶; also, *supra,* p. 22, note *.

** Śakráńí, in the original.

faultless shape."* With the assent of Aditi, Indra† then respectfully saluted Janárdana in all due form, and conducted him and Satyabhámá through Nandana and other pleasant gardens of the gods; where Keśava, the destroyer of Keśin,‡ saw the Párijáta-tree,§ the favourite of Śachí, which was produced when the ocean was churned for ambrosia: the bark was of gold; and it was embellished with young sprouting leaves of a copper colour, and fruit-stalks bearing numerous clusters of fragrant fruit.|| When Satyabhámá noticed this tree, she said to her beloved lord, Govinda: "Why should not this divine tree¶ be transported to Dwáraká? If what you say is true, and I am really dear to you, then let this tree be taken away from hence, and planted in the garden** of my dwelling. You have often said to me: 'Neither Jámbavatí nor Rukmińí is so dear to me, Satyá, as you are.' If you have spoken the truth, and not mere flattery,†† then let this Párijáta-tree be the ornament of my mansion. I long to shine amidst my fellow-queens, wearing the flowers of this tree in the braids of my hair."‡‡

---

* मत्प्रसादान्न ते सुभ्रु जरा वैरूप्यमेव च ।
भविष्यत्यनवद्याङ्गि सर्वकामा भविष्यसि ॥

† The Sanskrit has *deva-rája*.

‡ *Keśisúdana*. I have corrected "Keśi". See Vol. IV., p. 340.

§ See Vol. I., p. 144, and p. 146, note 1.

|| This description of the Párijáta-tree is rendered very freely. The original gives it one epithet not here translated,—*sugandháďhya*, 'rich in fragrance'. The text followed is that of Śrídhara, from which various MSS. offer many unimportant deviations.

¶ Professor Wilson read देवपादपः; but, no doubt, we should read देव पादपः. A variant is found: कृष्ण पादपः ।

** *Nishkuťa*.

†† *Upachára*.

‡‡ *Keśa-paksha*.

Thus solicited by Satyabhámá, Hari smiled upon her, and, taking the Párijáta-plant, put it upon Garuḋa.* The keepers of the garden (remonstrated and) said: "This Párijáta-tree belongs to Śachí, the queen of the sovereign of the gods. It is not proper, Govinda, for you to remove it. At the time when the ocean was churned for the beverage of immortality,† this tree was produced, for the purpose of providing Śachí with flowery ornaments. You cannot be suffered to depart with it.‡ It is through ignorance that this is sought for by any one; as it is the especial property of her on whose countenance the king of the gods delights to look. And who shall go away with impunity, who attempts to carry it off?§ Assuredly, the king of the gods will punish this audacity; for his hand launches the thunderbolt, and the immortals attend upon his steps.|| Forbear, then, Kŕishńa; nor provoke the hostility of all the gods.¶ The wise will not commence actions that can be productive only of unpleasant consequences."** Satyabhámá, on hearing these words, was exceedingly offended, and said: "What right has

---

* Called, in the original, Garutmat.

† अमृतमन्थने ।

‡ न क्षेमी गृहीत्वैनं गमिष्यसि ।

§ देवराजो मुखप्रेक्षो यस्यास्तस्याः परिग्रहम् ।
मौढ्यात्प्रार्थयसे क्षेमी गृहीत्वैनं हि को व्रजेत् ॥

Some MSS. read देव, instead of क्षेमी ।

|| वज्रोद्यतकरं शक्रमनुयास्यन्ति चामराः ।

¶ तदलं सकलैर्देवैर्विग्रहेण तवाच्युत ।

** विपाककटु यत्कर्म तन्न शंसन्ति पण्डिताः ।

"The wise do not commend an act disagreeable in *its* consequences.'

Śachí, what has Indra,* to the Párijáta-tree? It was produced at the churning of the ocean, as the common property of all worlds. Wherefore, gods, should Indra† alone possess it? In the same manner, guardians of the grove, as nectar, as the moon, as (the goddess) Śrí (herself), so the Párijáta-tree is the common property of all the world; and, since Śachí, confiding in the strength of her husband's arm, would keep it to herself, away with submission to her!‡ Satyá takes away the tree. Go quickly; and let Paulomí§ be told what I have said. Repeat to her this contemptuous message from Satyabhámá: 'If you are the beloved wife of your lord, if your husband is obedient to your authority, let him prevent my husband from carrying off this tree. I know your husband, Śakra; I know the sovereign of the divinities; and I, who am a mortal,|| take this Párijáta-tree away from you.'"

Accordingly, the warders (of the garden) went and reported to Śachí the message (of Satyabhámá). Śachí appealed to her husband, and excited the king of the gods to resent this affront;¶ and Indra, accordingly, attended by the army of the celestials, marched to attack Hari, in defence of the Párijáta-tree. The gods were armed with clubs,** swords,†† maces, and darts;

---

* Śakra, in the Sanskrit.

† The original has Vásava.

‡ तत्कथ्यतामलं चान्या ।

§ Patronymic of Puloman, father of Śachí. See Vol. II., p. 72, note 2. For a less famous Paulomí, see Vol. I., p. 152, note 1, *ad finem*.

|| *Mánushí*, 'a woman.' Śachí, no less than Satyabhámá, was "a mortal".

¶ शची चोत्साहयामास त्रिदशाधिपतिं पतिम् ।

** *Parigha.* †† *Nistriṁśa.*

and Indra* wielded the thunderbolt. As soon as Govinda saw the king of the gods† advancing against him, on his elephant, attended by the immortals,‡ he blew his shell, so that the sound filled all the regions, and he showered, smilingly, myriads of arrows upon his assailants.§ Beholding the air, in all directions, overspread with his darts, the celestials (in return,) hurled innumerable missiles; but every one of these the destroyer of Madhu,|| and lord of all worlds, cut, playfully, into a thousand pieces (with his shafts). The devourer of serpents (Garuda,) laid hold of the noose of the sovereign of the waters,¶ and tore it to fragments with his beak, as if it had been a little snake. The son of Devakí threw his mace at the club of Yama, and cast it, broken, upon the ground. He cut in bits** the litter†† of the lord of wealth,‡‡ with his discus; a glance of his eye eclipsed the radiance of the sun;§§ he severed Agni into a hundred parts, with his arrows, and scattered the Vasus through the realms of space. With his discus he cut off the points of the tridents|||| of the Rudras, and cast themselves upon the earth; and,

---

* Śakra, in the original.

† For "the king of the gods" the Sanskrit has Śakra.

‡ Literally, 'the gods,'—*deva*.

§ मुमोच च शरव्रातं सहस्रायुतसंमितम् ।

Professor Wilson's favourite MS. indefensibly ends this verse with सहस्रायुतसस्मितं; whence "smilingly". Read: "And he discharged a volley of arrows, amounting to myriads of thousands."

|| Madhusúdana.

¶ Namely, Varuńa.

** *Tilaśas.* This word denotes that the pieces were no larger than sesamum-seeds.

†† *Śibiká.*

‡‡ Kubera, to wit.

§§ चकार शौरिरर्कं च दृष्टिदृष्टं हतौजसम् ।

|||| *Śúla*, 'pikes.'

with the shafts shot from his bow, he dispersed the Sádhyas, Viśwas,* Maruts, and Gandharvas, like fleeces of cotton from the pods of the Simel† tree, through the sky. Garuḋa,‡ also, diligently plied his beak, and wings, and nails, and bit, and bruised, and scratched the deities who opposed his lord.§

Then the king of the gods and the foe of Madhu|| (encountered, and) overwhelmed each other with countless shafts, like rain-drops falling from two heavy clouds. Garuḋa, in the conflict, engaged with Airávata; and Janárdana was opposed to all the deities. When all the other weapons had been cut to pieces, Indra¶ stood armed with his thunderbolt, and Kŕishńa, with the discus Sudarśana.** Beholding them thus prepared for fight, all the people of the three spheres exclaimed

---

* *Viśwe.* These deities are not mentioned severally, but always collectively. See Vol. III., p. 189, note beginning near the foot.

† शाल्मलितूलवत् । The original has, thus, *Śálmali.* See Vol. IV., p. 240, note ||.

‡ The Sanskrit has Garutmat.

§ गरुत्मानपि वक्त्रेण पक्षाभ्यां नखराङ्कुरैः ।
भक्षयंस्ताडयन्देवान्दारयंश्च चचार वै ॥

Herein is exemplified the figure of speech which is called, in Sanskrit, *yathá-sankhyá.* A similar, but more complete, instance of construction by the correspondent order of terms is afforded in the following couplet:

"Vir simplex, fortasse bonus, sed pastor ineptus,
Vult, tentat, peragit, plurima, pauca, nihil."

Stanzas of like verbal collocation might be adduced, in any quantity, from medieval compositions. In the Third Book of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* is a sonnet contrived, throughout, like its beginning:

"Vertue, beautie, and speech, did strike, wound, charme,
My heart, eyes, eares, with wonder, love, delight."

|| Madhusúdana.

¶ Vásava, in the original.

** छिन्नेष्वशेषबाणेषु शस्त्रेष्वस्त्रेषु च त्वरन् ।
जग्राह वासवो वज्रं कृष्णश्चक्रं सुदर्शनम् ।

"Alas! alas!" Indra* launched his bolt; but in vain; for Hari caught and arrested it. He forbore, however, to hurl his discus, and only called out to Indra to stay.† Satyabhámá, seeing Indra disarmed, and his elephant disabled by Garuḍa, and the deity, himself, about to retreat, said to him: "King of the triple sphere, it ill becomes the husband of Śachí to run away. Ornamented with Párijáta-garlands, she will approach you. Of what use‡ is the sovereignty of heaven, embellished with the Párijáta-tree, no longer beholding Śachí meet you with affection, as of yore? Nay, Śakra: fly not! You must not suffer shame. Here, take the Párijáta-tree. Let the gods be no longer annoyed. Śachí, inflated with pride of her husband, has not welcomed me to her dwelling with respectful presents. As a woman, I am light of purpose, and am anxious for my husband's fame. Therefore have I instigated, Śakra, this contest with you. But I do not want the Párijáta-tree; nor do I wish to take that which is another's property. Śachí is proud of her beauty. What woman is not proud of her husband?" Thus spoken to (by Satyabhámá), the king of the gods turned back, and said to her: "Desist, wrathful dame, from afflicting your friend by further reproaches.§ I am not ashamed of being vanquished by him who is the author of the creation, preservation,

---

* Mahendra, in the Sanskrit.

† Hereabouts the translation is free.

‡ The insertion, here, of the words "to you", justified by the original, would make this sentence intelligible. The Sanskrit is as follows:

कीदृशं देवराज्यं ते पारिजातस्रगुज्ज्वलम् ।
अपश्यतो यथापूर्वं प्रणयादागतां शचीम् ॥

§ प्राह चैनामलं चण्डि सख्युः खेदातिविस्तरैः ।

and destruction of the world; who is the substance of all things;* in whom, without beginning or middle, the universe is comprised; and from whom, and by whom, identical with all things, it proceeds, and will cease to be.† What disgrace is it, O goddess, (to any one,) to be discomfited by him who is the cause of creation, continuance, and dissolution? His form is the parent of all worlds, though infinitely subtile, and known to those only by whom all that may be known is known. Who is able to overcome the unborn, unconstituted, eternal lord, who has willed to become a mortal, for the good of the world?"[1]

---

[1] The Bhágavata‡ merely says: "Incited by his wife, Kŕishńa took away the Párijáta-tree, having subdued the gods, and planted it in the garden of Satyabhámá." The Hari Vaḿśa makes a long story of it, and tells it with some variations, especially in the commencement; Satyabhámá's desire for the Párijáta-tree having been excited by Nárada's presenting a flower from it to Kŕishńa's other spouse, Rukmińí.

---

* *Viśwa-rúpin.*

† यस्मिञ्जगत्सकलमेतदनादिमध्ये
यस्माद्यतश्च न भविष्यति सर्वभूतात् ।

‡ X., Latter Section, IX., 39, 40:

नोदितो भार्ययोत्पाट्य पारिजातं गरुत्मति ।
आरोप्य सेन्द्रान्विबुधान्निर्जित्योपानयत्पुरम् ॥
स्थापितः सत्यभामाया गृहोद्यानोपशोभनः ।
अन्वगुर्भ्रमराः स्वर्गात्तद्गन्धासवलंपटाः ॥

CHAPTER XXXI.

Kṛishńa, with Indra's consent, takes the Párijáta-tree to Dwáraká; marries the princesses rescued from Naraka.

KEŚAVA, being thus eulogized by the king of the gods, smiled, and spake gravely to him (in reply). "Thou art Indra," said he, "the king of the celestials. We are (but) mortals, O lord of the world. Thou must pardon, therefore, the offence that I have committed. Let this Párijáta-tree be taken to its appropriate situation. I removed it in compliance with the words of Satyá. Receive back, also, this your thunderbolt, cast at me: for this is your proper weapon,*—the destroyer of your foes." Indra† answered, and said: "Thou beguilest us, O lord, in calling thyself a mortal. But we know thee to be the lord, although not endowed‡ with subtlety of discernment. Thou art that thou art, engaged in the (active) preservation § of the earth; thou extractest the thorns implanted in her bosom, destroyer of the demon-race.|| Let this Párijáta-tree be transferred to Dwáraká;¶ and it shall remain upon earth as long as thou abidest in the world of mortals."** Hari, having assented to the proposal of Indra,†† returned to

---

* *Praharańa.*

† Śakra, in the original.

‡ That is to say, "although we are not endowed."

§ *Tráńa.*

|| जगतः शल्यनिष्कर्षं करोष्यसुरसूदन ।

¶ The Sanskrit has Dwáravatí.

** मर्त्यलोके त्वया मुक्तो नायं संस्थास्यते भुवि ।

†† *Devendra,* in the Sanskrit.

earth, hymned by attendant sages,* saints,† and quiristers of heaven.

When Kŕishńa arrived over Dwáraká, he blew his shell, and delighted all the inhabitants with the sound. Then, alighting from Garuda, he proceeded, with Satyabhámá, to her garden,‡ and there planted the great Párijáta-tree, the smell of which perfumed the earth for three furlongs, § and an approach to which enabled every one to recollect (the events of) a prior existence; so that, on beholding their faces in that tree, all the Yádavas contemplated themselves in their (original) celestial forms.|| Then Kŕishńa took possession of the wealth, elephants, horses, and women, which he had recovered from Naraka, and which had been brought (to Dwáraká) by the servants (of the demon); and, at an auspicious season, he¶ espoused all the maidens whom Naraka had carried off (from their friends): at one and the same moment,** he†† received the hands of all of them, according to the ritual, in separate mansions.‡‡ Sixteen thousand and one hundred was the number of the maidens.§§ And into so many dif-

---

* *Siddha.*

† *Ŕishi.*

‡ *Nishkuťa.*

§ *Yojana.*

|| ततस्ते यादवाः सर्वे देहबन्धानमानुषान् ।
ददृशुः पादपे तस्मिन्कुर्वन्तो मुखदर्शनम् ॥

¶ The Sanskrit here has Janárdana.

** *Kála.*

†† Govinda, in the original.

‡‡ Instead of पृथग्गेहेषु, there is a variant, पृथग्देहेषु, importing "in multiplied persons."

§§ Our Puráńa is at variance with itself as to the number of Kŕishńa's wives. See Vol. IV., p. 112, with which compare pp. 81, 82, *supra*.

ferent forms did the foe of Madhu* multiply himself; so that every one of the damsels thought that he had wedded her, in his single person.† And the creator of the world, Hari, the assumer of universal shape, abode severally in the dwelling of each of these his wives.‡

---

* Madhusúdana.

† एकैकश्येन ताः कन्या मेनिरे मधुसूदनम् ।
मम्मैव पाणिग्रहणं भगवान्कृतवानिति ॥

Śrídhara, at least according to my single MS. of his commentary, begins this stanza with एकैकरूपेन, at the expense of metrical correctness.

‡ निशासु च जगत्स्रष्टा तासां गेहेषु केशवः ।
उवास विप्र सर्वासां विश्वरूपधरो हरिः ॥

CHAPTER XXXII.

Children of Kŕishńa. Úshá, the daughter of Báńa, sees Aniruddha in a dream, and becomes enamoured of him.

PARÁŚARA.—I have enumerated to you Pradyumna and the other sons of Rukmińí. Satyabhámá bore Bhánu* and Bhaimarika.† The sons of Rohińí were Díptimat, Támrapaksha,‡ and others. The powerful Sámba§ and other sons were born of Jámbavatí. Bhadravinda|| and other valiant youths were the sons of Nágnajití. Śaibyá (or Mitravindá¶) had several sons, of whom Sangrámajit was the chief. Vŕika and others were begotten (by Hari) on Mádrí.** Lakshmańá had Gátravat and others; and Śruta and others were the sons†† of Kálindí[1],‡‡ Kŕishńa§§ had sons, also, by his

[1] The Bhágavata says, each of his eight queens had ten sons,

* Two MSS. have Bháru.

† Corrected from "Bhairika." In giving this mangled form of the name, Professor Wilson was misled by an error in his favourite MS. The scansion of the line shows that a syllable is missing. Messrs. Böhtlingk and Roth have helped to perpetuate "Bhairika".

‡ Corrected from "Támrapakshi", in which reading Professor Wilson was again led astray by an error in the MS. referred to in the last note. Messrs. Böhtlingk and Roth wrongly credit our Translator with "Támrapakshin". One of my MS. yields Támravarńa; another, "Díptimat and others". Also *vide supra*, p. 79, note **.

§ Corrected from "Śámba". || My Ajmere MS. has Bhadramanda.

¶ Supplied by the Translator, on the authority of the commentator Śridhara. Ratnagarbha considers Śaibyá as one of Kŕishńa's eight wives of the first order; but he does not identify her, by name, with any one of those specified in note § to p. 78, *supra*.

** *Vide supra*, p. 81, note *.

†† There were three of them,—unnamed,—according to the reading of my Arrah MS. ‡‡ *Vide supra*, p. 78, note §, and p. 81, note 1.

§§ Chakrin, in the original.

other wives,—in all, one hundred and eighty thousand. The eldest of the whole was Pradyumna, the son of Rukmińí: his son was Aniruddha, from whom Vajra* was born: his mother was Úshá,†—the daughter of Báńa, and granddaughter of Bali,‡—whom Aniruddha won in war.§ On that occasion, a fierce battle took place between Hari and Śankara, in which the thousand arms of Báńa were lopped away by the discus of the former.||

MAITREYA.—How happened it, (venerable) Brahman, that a contest on account of Úshá arose between Śiva¶ and Kŕishńa? And in what manner did Hari cut off the thousand arms of Báńa?** This, illustrious sir, thou art able to narrate.††

PARÁŚARA.—Úshá, the daughter of Báńa, having seen Párvatí sporting with (her lord,) Śambhu, was inspired with a wish for similar dalliance. The beautiful Gaurí,‡‡ who knows the hearts of all, said to Úshá:

---

and gives the ten names of each set, with one or two exceptions.§§

---

* Corrected from "Vraja". See Vol. IV., pp. 112, 113.

† Corrected, here and everywhere below, from "Ushá", which, likewise, occurs, but not in our Puráńa.

‡ See Vol. II., p. 69.

§ The original is अनिरुद्धो रणे रुद्धः।

|| The Sanskrit has Chakrin.

¶ Hara, in the Sanskrit.

** कथं क्षयं च बाणस्य बाहूनां कृतवान्हरिः।

†† The original adds:

महत्कौतूहलं जातं कथां श्रोतुमिमां हरेः।

So reads Śrídhara. Ratnagarbha has:

महत्कौतूहलं जातं कथयात्र कथामिमाम्।

‡‡ The same as Párvatí. See Vol. I., p. 104, note 1.

§§ *Vide supra*, p. 79, notes *, †, §, ¶, and **; p. 81, notes * and †; and p. 82, note ||||.

"Do not grieve. You shall have a husband."* "But when will this be?" thought Úshá to herself. "Or who will be my lord?" On which, Párvatí continued: "He who shall appear to you, princess, in a dream, on the twelfth lunation † of the light half of Vaiśákha, he will be your husband."‡ Accordingly, as the goddess had foretold, on that lunar day a youth appeared (to Úshá,) in a dream, of whose person she became enamoured. When she woke, and no longer perceived him, she was overcome with sorrow, and, unrestrained by modesty, demanded of her companion whither he had gone. The companion and friend of the princess was Chitralekhá, the daughter of Kumbháńd́a,§ the minister of Báńa. "Of whom do you speak?" inquired she (of Úshá). But the princess, recollecting herself, was ashamed, and remained silent.|| At length, however, Chitralekhá conciliated her confidence; and she related to her what had passed, and what the goddess had foretold; and she requested her friend to devise some means of uniting her with the person whom she had beheld in her dream.¶

Chitralekhá then delineated the most eminent gods,** demons,†† spirits,‡‡ and mortals, and showed them (to

---

* अलमत्यर्थतापेन भर्त्ता त्वमपि रंस्यसे ।

† By this word Professor Wilson intends, at variance with scientific precedent, and otherwise entirely without justification, 'lunar day'.

‡ In this sentence, and in the next, the Translator, with commendable taste, has not reproduced the grossness of the original.

§ Corrected from "Kubháńda".

|| यदा लज्जाकुला नास्मै कथयामास सा सखी ।

¶ देव्या तथैव तत्प्राप्तौ योऽभ्युपायः कुरुष्व तम् ।

** *Sura.* †† *Daitya.* ‡‡ *Gandharva.*

Úshá). Putting aside the portraits of gods, spirits, snake-gods,* and demons,† the princess selected those of mortals, and, amongst them, the heroes of the races of Andhaka and Vŕishńi.‡ When she came to (the likenesses of) Kŕishńa and Ráma, she was confused with shame.§ From (the portrait of) Pradyumna she modestly averted her eyes; but, the moment she beheld the picture of his son, the object of her passion, her eyes wide expanded, and all her bashfulness was discarded.|| "This is he! This is he!" said she (to Chitralekhá). And her friend, who was endowed with magic power,¶ bade her be of good cheer, and set off, through the air, to Dwáraká.**

---

* *Uraga.*

† *Asura.*

‡ मनुष्येषु ददौ दृष्टिं तेष्वप्यन्धकवृष्णिषु ।

For Andhaka and Vŕishńi, see Vol. IV., pp. 71, *et seq.*

§ *Lajjá-jaḋa.*

|| दृष्ट्यात्यर्थविकाशिन्या लज्जा क्वापि निराकृता ।

¶ *Yoga-gámin.*

** Dwáravatí, in the original.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Báńa solicits Śiva for war: finds Aniruddha in the palace, and makes him prisoner. Kŕishńa, Balaráma, and Pradyumna come to his rescue. Śiva and Skanda aid Báńa: the former is disabled; the latter, put to flight. Báńa encounters Kŕishńa, who cuts off all his arms, and is about to put him to death. Śiva intercedes; and Kŕishńa spares his life. Vishńu and Śiva are the same.

BEFORE this took place, Báńa had been engaged in the adoration of the three-eyed* (god), and had thus prayed to him: "I am humiliated,† O lord, by (the possession of) a thousand arms in a state of peace. Let some hostilities ensue, in which I may derive some advantage from their possession. Without war, what is the use of these arms? They are but a burthen to me."‡ Śankara replied: "When thy peacock-banner shall be broken, thou shalt have war,—the delight of the evil spirits that feast on the flesh of man."§ Báńa, pleased (by this promise), proffered his thanks|| to Śambhu, and returned to his palace, where he found his standard broken; at which his joy was increased.

At that time, the nymph Chitralekhá returned (from Dwáraká), and, by the exercise of her magic power, brought Aniruddha (along with her). The guards of

---

* Trilochana. See Vol. I., p. 141.

† *Nirvinna.*

‡ कच्चिन्ममैषां बाहूनां साफल्यजनको रणः।
भविष्यति विना युद्धं भाराय मम किं भुजैः॥

§ पिशिताशिजनानन्दं प्राप्स्यसि त्वं तदा रणम्।

|| The Sanskrit has simply प्रणम्य।

the inner apartments, discovering him there with Úshá,* reported it to the king, who immediately sent a body of his followers (to seize the prince). But the valiant youth, taking up an iron club, slew his assailants;† on which, Báńa mounted his car, advanced against him, and endeavoured to put him to death. Finding, however, that Aniruddha was not to be subdued by prowess, he followed the counsel of his minister, and brought his magical faculties into the conflict, by which he succeeded in capturing the Yadu prince, and binding him in serpent-bonds.‡

When Aniruddha was missed from Dwáravatí, and the Yádavas were inquiring of one another whither he had gone, Nárada came to them, and told them that he was the prisoner of Báńa; having been conveyed, by a female possessed of magic faculties, to Śońitapura.[1]§ When they heard this, they were satisfied;

---

[1] The synonyms of Śońitapura, in the Trikáńda Śesha,|| are Devíkoťa, Báńapura, Koťívarsha, and Ushávana.¶ The first is, usually, considered to be the modern Devicotta, in the Carnatic, which is commonly believed to be the scene of Báńa's defeat. The name, however, occurs in other parts of India: in the Deccan, on the banks of the Godávarí,—according to Wilford, the capital of Munja (Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX., p. 199); and in Assam,

---

* तं रममाणं सहोषया ।

† जघान परिघं लौहमादाय परवीरहा ।

‡ ततस्तं पन्नगास्त्रेण बबन्ध यदुनन्दनम् ।

§ The translation, hereabouts, is rather free.

|| II., I., 17.

¶ The better reading, it seems, is Umávana, as in the *Haima-kośa*, IV., 43, where, also, we find all the synonyms of Śońitapura which are specified above.

for they had imagined he had been taken away by the gods, (in reprisal for the Párijáta-tree).* Kŕishńa,† therefore, immediately summoned Garuda, who came with a wish;‡ and, mounting upon him, along with Bala and Pradyumna, he set off for the city of Báńa. On their approach to the city, they were opposed by the spirits who attend on Rudra:§ but these were soon destroyed by Hari; and he and his companions reached the vicinity of the town.|| Here, mighty Fever—an emanation from Maheśwara,¶ having three feet and three heads[1],—fought desperately with Vishńu,** in defence of Báńa. Baladeva, upon whom his ashes were

---

near Gwálpára, as the city of the Daityas. Asiatic Researches, Vol. XIV., p. 443. Hamilton†† notices the remains of a city, so called, in Dinajpoor. In the Káliká Purâńa, Báńa is described as the friend and, apparently, neighbour of Naraka, king of Prágjyotisha‡‡ or Assam.

[1] Alluding to the three stages of febrile paroxysms, or to the recurrence of tertian ague. A contest with this enemy, in the course of military operations, is an allegory which the British armies in India too often illustrate.

---

* तं शोणितपुरे श्रुत्वा नीतं विद्याविदग्धया।
यीषिता प्रत्ययं जग्मुर्यादवा नामरैरिति॥

† The Sanskrit has Hari.

‡ *I. e.*, "at his wish".

§ The Translator takes from Śrídhara this explanation of *pramatha*.

|| पुरीप्रवेशे प्रमथैर्युद्धमासीन्महात्मनः।
ययौ बाणपुराभ्याशं नीत्वा तान्संक्षयं हरिः॥

¶ *Máheśwara* is the word translated by "an emanation from Maheśwara."

** *Śárnga-dhanwan*, "armed with the bow Śárnga," is the term by which Kŕishńa is here called, in the original.

†† *History, &c. of Eastern India*, Vol. II., p. 660.

‡‡ *Vide supra*, p. 54, note 1; p. 55, note ‡; and p. 88, note 1.

scattered, was seized with burning heat, and his eyelids trembled; but he obtained relief by clinging to the body of Kŕishńa.* Contending, thus, with the divine holder of the bow,† the Fever (emanating from Śiva) was quickly expelled from the person of Kŕishńa by Fever‡ which he himself engendered.§ Brahmá,|| beholding the impersonated malady bewildered by the beating inflicted by the arms of the deity, entreated the latter to desist; and the foe of Madhu refrained, and absorbed into himself the Fever he had created.¶ The rival Fever then departed, saying to Kŕishńa: "Those men who call to memory the combat between us shall be (ever) exempt from febrile disease."**

Next, Vishńu overcame and demolished the five fires,[1]†† and, with perfect ease,‡‡ annihilated the army

---

[1] The Áhavaníya, Gárhapatya, Dakshińa, Sabhya, and Ávasathya are the five fires; of which the three first have a religious, and the other two, a secular, character. The first is a fire pre-

---

* तद्गस्पर्शसंभूततापः कृष्णाङ्गसंगमात् ।
अवाप बलदेवोऽपि शममामीलितेक्षणः ॥

† To render Śárngin, as Kŕishńa is denominated from his bow spoken of in note ** in the preceding page.

‡ *Vaishńava* is the epithet given it in the Sanskrit.

§ Kŕishńa here figures as a practitioner of homoeopathy.

|| Pitámaha, in the original.

¶ नारायणभुजाघातपरिपीडनविह्वलम् ।
तं वीक्ष्य क्षम्यतामस्येत्याह देवः पितामहः ॥
ततश्च क्षान्तमेवेति प्रोक्त्वा तं वैष्णवं ज्वरम् ।
आत्मन्येव लयं निन्ये भगवान्मधुसूदनः ॥

** *Vijwara.*

†† "The protectors of that city",—namely, Báńa's, says Ratnagarbha.

‡‡ लीलया ।

of the Dánavas. Then the son of Bali (Báńa), with the whole of the Daitya* host, assisted by Śankara and Kárttikeya,† fought with Śauri. A fierce combat took place between Hari and Śankara. All the regions shook, scorched by their flaming weapons; and the celestials felt assured that the end of the universe was at hand. Govinda, with the weapon of yawning, set Śankara agape; and then the demons‡ and the demigods attendant upon Śiva§ were destroyed on every side; for Hara, overcome with incessant gaping, sat down in his car, and was unable longer to contend with Kŕishńa, whom no acts affect.|| The deity of war, Kárttikeya,¶ wounded in the arm by Garuda,** struck by the weapons of Pradyumna, and disarmed by the shout of

pared for oblations at an occasional sacrifice; the second is the household fire, to be perpetually maintained; the third is a sacrificial fire, in the centre of the other two, and placed to the south; the Sabhya is a fire lighted to warm a party; and the Ávasathya,†† the common domestic or culinary fire. Manu, III., 100, 185,‡‡ and Kullúka Bhatta's explanation.§§

* Daiteya, in the Sanskrit.

† See Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXXIX.; and Vol. II., p. 23.

‡ *Daiteya.*

§ In definition of *pramatha.*

|| *Aklishta-karman*, "unweariable."

¶ For "the deity of war, Kárttikeya," the Sanskrit has, simply, Guha.

** Professor Wilson has followed the reading of Śrídhara, as it appears in the only copy of his commentary to which we, in common, have had access,— गरुडचतवाङ्गः. Ratnagarbha adopts the ordinary lection, गरुडचतवाहः ।

†† Corrected from "Ávasatthya."

‡‡ Neither thence nor from Kullúka's comments is much to be gleaned touching the five fires.

§§ Also see Vol. III., p. 175, note §; and Vol. IV., p. 11, note 1.

Hari,* took to flight. Báńa, when he saw Śankara disabled, the Daityas destroyed, Guha† fled, and Śiva's followers‡ slain,§ advanced, on his vast car,—the horses of which were harnessed|| by Nandíśa,—¶ to encounter Kŕishńa and his associates Bala and Pradyumna.** The valiant Balabhadra, attacking the host of Báńa, wounded them, in many ways, with his arrows, and put them to a shameful rout;†† and their sovereign beheld them dragged about by Ráma,‡‡ with his ploughshare, or beaten, by him, with his club, or pierced, by Kŕishńa,§§ with his arrows. He, therefore, attacked Kŕishńa; and a fight took place between them. They cast at each other fiery shafts, that pierced through their armour: but Kŕishńa intercepted, with his arrows, those of Báńa, and cut them to pieces. Báńa, nevertheless, wounded Keśava; and the wielder of the discus wounded Báńa; and both, desirous of victory, and seeking, enraged, the death of his antagonist, hurled (various) missiles at each other. When

---

* The original has Kŕishńa.

† *I. e.,* Kárttikeya.

‡ To render *pramatha-sainya.*

§ शार्ङ्गधन्वना, "by the bearer of the bow Śárnga", the original particularizes.

|| Read 'driven',—*sangŕihita.*

¶ Also called Nandi and Nandin. Generally he is represented as a follower of Śiva. See Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXXIX., and p. 122.

** The Sanskrit here calls him by his patronym, Kárshńi.

†† बलभद्रो महावीर्यो बाणसैन्यमनेकधा ।
विव्याध बाणैः प्रभ्रश्य धर्मतस्तत्पलायत ॥

Ratnagarbha ends the second verse with धर्मतश्चापलायत:; and some MSS. give, with this reading, संहृष्टः, instead of प्रभ्रश्य।

‡‡ Bala, in the original.

§§ The Sanskrit has Chakrin.

an infinite number of arrows* had been cut to pieces, and the weapons began to be exhausted,† Kṙishṅa‡ resolved to put Báṅa to death. The destroyer§ of the demon-host, therefore, took up his discus, Sudarśana, blazing with the radiance of a hundred suns As he‖ was in the act of casting it, the mystical goddess Koṫaví,¶ the magic lore of the demons, stood, naked, before him.[1]** Seeing her before him, Kṙishṅa,†† with unclosed eyes, cast Sudarśana, to cut off the arms‡‡ of Báṅa. The discus, dreaded, in its flight, by the whole of the weapons of the demons, lopped off, successively,

---

[1] Koṫaví (कोटवी) is said to be an eighth portion of Rudráṅí, and the tutelary goddess of the Daityas, composed of incantations (मन्त्रमयी).§§ The Hari Vaṁśa‖‖ calls her, also, Lambá, and intimates her being the mother of Báṅa, and as identical with Durgá. The word, in the lexicons, designates a naked woman, and is, thence, applicable to Durgá, in some of her forms.

---

* The Sanskrit yields "all the arrows".

† अस्त्रे च सीदति प्राचुर्येण। Ratnagarbha explains this as follows: प्राचुर्येणास्त्रे सीदति क्षीणे सति।

‡ Hari, in the original.

§ Read "enemy",—*ari*.

‖ Here called, in the original, by his epithetical appellation, Madhudwish, or Madhuvidwish, according to various copies.

¶ Variant: Kodaví. And Ratnagarbha, in my best MSS., has Koṫṫaví.

** नग्ना दैतेयविद्याभूत्कोटवी पुरतो हरेः।

Ratnagarbha says: कोट्टवी दैत्यविद्या मन्त्रमयी दैत्यकुलदेवता। Also see note §§, below.

†† The Sanskrit has Hari.

‡‡ बाहुवनं, according to Śrídhara. बाहुबलं is Ratnagarbha's reading.

§§ This is from Śrídhara, who says: कोटवी नाम दैतेयानां विद्यामन्त्रमयी कुलदेवता रुद्राण्या अष्टमांशः।

‖‖ *Śl.* 10722.

the numerous arms of the Asura. Beholding Kŕishńa with the discus again in his hand, and preparing to launch it once more, for the total demolition of Báńa, the foe of Tripura* (Śiva,) respectfully addressed him.† The husband of Umá,‡ seeing the blood streaming from

---

* In the Eighth Chapter of the *Revá-máhátmya*, it is said, that Tripurí-kshetra, where Śiva flung down Tripura, the Asura, lies to the north of the Narmadá. The Twenty-ninth Chapter of the same work somewhat discordantly relates as follows. The demon Báńa, in reward of his austerities as a votary of Śiva, received from him the gift of a city. Brahmá and Vishńu adding, each, another, he obtained the epithet of Tripura, or *Τρίπολις*. When slain by Śiva, as he was traversing the heavens, a part of his carcase fell near the well-known mountain Śriśaila, in Siddha-kshetra; another fragment, not far from Amarakańtaka; and the remainder, in the vicinity of Gangáságara. The weapon, Aghorástra, with which he was demolished, reached the earth at a point of the Narmadá hard by Jaleśwaratírtha, and sank to Rasátala, the nethermost of the infernal stages.

Where this tale is briefly rehearsed in the *Gańeśa Upapuráńa*,— Prior Section, Chapter LXXI.,— Báńa carries off Pradyumna, whose father, Kŕishńa, attacks the giant, and, after propitiating Gańeśa, overcomes the monster, and takes possession of his city, Sońitapura. Some ten chapters of the first half of the *Gańeśa Upapuráńa*, beginning with the thirty-eight. are taken up with Tripura or Báńa.

Trípurí, the capital of the Chedis,—a place connected with the preceding legends,— I discovered, while exploring the banks of the Narmadá, in the insignificant village of Tewar. See the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. VI., p. 516.

† The Translator has strangely misunderstood the import of the following stanzas:

क्रमेण तत्तु बाहूनां बाणस्याच्युतनोदितम् ।
छेदं चक्रेऽसुरापास्तशस्त्रौघक्षपणादृतम् ॥
छिन्ने बाहुसहस्रे तु करस्थं मधुसूदनः ।
मुमुक्षुर्बाणनाशाय विज्ञातस्त्रिपुरद्विषा ॥

Ratnagarbha reads -चोदितं, for -नोदितं; -क्षेपण°, for -क्षपण°; and बाहुबले तस्य, for बाहुसहस्रे तु. One other variant which I find is बाहुवने तस्य; and my Ajmere MS. interpolates, after the first verse of the extract:

चिच्छेद चक्रं बाहूनां सहस्रमतिवेगवत् ।

‡ *Umápati.*

the dissevered arms of Báńa, approached Govinda, to solicit a suspension of hostilities,* and said to him: "Kŕishńa, Kŕishńa, lord of the world, I know thee, first of spirits,† the supreme lord, infinite felicity, without beginning or end, and beyond all things.‡ This sport of universal being, in which thou takest the persons of god, animals, and men, is a subordinate attribute of thy energy.§ Be propitious, therefore, O lord, (unto me). I have given Báńa assurance of safety. Do not thou falsify that which I have spoken. He has grown old in devotion|| to me. Let him not incur thy displeasure. The Daitya has received a boon from me; and, therefore, I deprecate thy wrath." When he had concluded, Govinda, dismissing his resentment against the Asura, looked graciously on the lord of Umá,¶ the wielder of the trident,** and said to him: "Since you, Śankara, have given a boon unto Báńa, let him live. From respect to your promises, my discus is arrested.†† The assurance of safety granted by you is granted (also,) by me. You are fit to apprehend that you are not distinct from me.‡‡ *That* which I am thou art; and

---

* सामपूर्वम् ।

† *Purushottama.*

‡ "Beyond all things" is to render *para.*

§ देवतिर्यङ्मनुष्येषु शरीरग्रहणात्मिका ।
लीलेयं सर्वभूतस्य तव चेष्टोपलक्षणा ॥

|| *Saṁśraya.*

¶ *Umápati.*

** *Śúla-páńi.*

†† त्वद्वाक्यगौरवादेतन्मया चक्रं निवर्तितम् ।

‡‡ मत्तोऽविभिन्नमात्मानं द्रष्टुमर्हसि शंकर ।
"You must perceive," &c.

that, also, is this world, with its gods, demons,* and mankind. Men contemplate distinctions, because they are stupified by ignorance," So saying, Kŕishńa went to the place where the son of Pradyumna† was confined. The snakes that bound him were destroyed, being blasted by the breath of Garuda; and Kŕishńa, placing him,‡ along with his wife, upon the celestial bird,§ returned, with Pradyumna and Ráma, to Dwáraká.[1] ||

---

[1] There can be little doubt that this legend describes a serious struggle between the Śaivas and Vaishńavas, in which the latter, according to their own report, were victorious; and the Śaivas, although they attempt to make out a sort of compromise between Rudra and Kŕishńa, are obliged to admit his having the worst of the conflict, and his inability to protect his votary. The Bhágavata tells the story much as the text. The Hari Vaḿśa amplifies, even more than usual; the narrative occupying nearly seventy pages of the French translation. The legend is to be found, to the same purport, but in various degrees of detail, in the Agni Puráńa, Kúrma Puráńa, Padma Puráńa (Uttara Khańda), Vámana Puráńa, and Brahma Vaivarta Puráńa, (Kŕishńa Janma Khańda).

---

* *Asura.*

† In the original, Prádyumni. Aniruddha is intended.

‡ The Sanskrit has Aniruddha.

§ To represent Garutmat.

|| आजग्मुर्द्वारकां रामकार्ष्णिदामोदराः पुरीम् ।

"Ráma, Kárshńi, and Dámodara went to the city of Dwáraká."

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Pauńdraka, a Vásudeva, assumes the insignia and style of Kŕishńa, supported by the king of Káśi. Kŕishńa marches against and destroys them. The son of the king sends a magical being against Kŕishńa: destroyed by his discus, which also sets Benares on fire, and consumes it and its inhabitants.

MAITREYA.—Of a truth, the divine Śauri, having assumed a mortal body, performed great achievements in his easy victories over Śakra, and Śiva,* and all their attendant divinities.† I am now desirous to hear from you, illustrious (sage), what other mighty exploit the humiliator of the prowess of the celestials performed.

PARÁŚARA.—Hear, excellent Brahman,‡ with reverent attention, an account of the burning of Váráńasí § by Kŕishńa, in the course of his relieving the burthens of the earth.||

There was a Vásudeva who was called Pauńdraka,[1]

---

[1] From being, the commentator ¶ says, king of Puńdra.** The

---

* Śarva, in the original.

† चक्रे कर्म महच्छौरिर्बिभ्राणो मानुषीं तनुम् ।
जिगाय शक्रं शर्वं च सर्वदेवांश्च लीलया ॥

‡ *Viprarshi*; the same as *Brahmarshi*, for which term see Vol. III., p. 68, text and note 1.

§ Corrected, here and everywhere below, from "Varáńaśí" or "Varáńaśí."

|| भारावतारे । Variant: नरावतारे ।

¶ The two commentators have identically the same explanation of the name in question: पौण्ड्रदेशजः, "born in the country of the Pauńdras." They do not call Pauńdraka a king.

** See Vol. II., p. 170, note 5.

and who, though not *the* Vásudeva, was flattered, by ignorant people, as the descended deity, until he fancied himself to be the Vásudeva[1] who had come down upon earth.* Losing all recollection (of his real character), he assumed the emblems of Vishńu, and sent an ambassador to the magnanimous Kŕishńa, with this message: "Relinquish, thou foolish fellow, the discus. Lay aside all my insignia, my name, and the character of Vásudeva, and come and do me homage; and I will vouchsafe thee means of subsistence."† At which, Janárdana laughed, and replied: "Go, messenger, back to Pauńd́raka, and say to him, from me: 'I will despatch‡ to thee my emblem the discus, without fail. Thou wilt rightly apprehend my meaning, and consider what is to be done; for I shall come to

---

Bhágavata§ calls him chief of the Kárúshas;|| the Padma, king of Káśi; but the Bhágavata, as well as our text, makes the king of Káśi¶ his friend and ally.

[1] According to the Padma Puráńa, he propitiates Śiva, and obtains from him the insignia which constitute a Vásudeva. The different authorities for this legend all use the term Vásudeva in the sense of a title.

---

* पौण्ड्रको वासुदेवस्तु वासुदेवोऽभवद्भुवि ।
अवतीर्णस्त्वमित्युक्तो जनैरज्ञानमोहितैः ॥
स मेने वासुदेवोऽहमवतीर्णो महीतले ।

† वासुदेवात्मकं मूढ मुक्त्वा सर्वं विशेषतः ।
आत्मनो जीवितार्थाय ततो मे प्रणतिं व्रज ॥

गर्वं, for सर्वं, is the reading of some MSS.

‡ समुत्स्रक्ष्ये ।

§ X., Latter Section, Chapter XVI.

|| See Vol. III., p. 240, notes 1, *etc.*

¶ In all such cases, read "king of the Káśis."

thy city, bringing the discus with me, and shall, undoubtedly, consign* it to thee. If thou wilt command me to come, I will immediately obey, and be with thee to-morrow. There shall be no delay.† And, having sought thy asylum, I will so provide, O king, that I shall never more have anything to dread from thee.'" So saying, he dismissed the ambassador, (to report these words to his sovereign), and, summoning,‡ Garuḋa,§ mounted him, and set off for the city (of Pauńḋraka[1]).

---

[1] The Hari Vaḿśa and Padma Puráńa send Pauńḋraka to Dwáraká. According to the latter, Nárada incites Pauńḋraka to the aggression, telling him he cannot be a Vásudeva till he has overcome Kŕishńa. He goes, and is killed. The former work, as usual, enters into particulars of its own invention. Kŕishńa is absent on a visit to Śiva at Kailása; and, during his absence, Pauńḋraka, assisted by Ekalavya,|| king of the Nishádas, makes a night-attack upon Dwáraká. They are resisted by the Yádavas, under Sátyaki and Balaráma; by the former of whom Pauńḋraka is repeatedly overthrown, and all but slain. He requires so much killing, however, that he is likely to obtain the victory; when Kŕishńa comes to the aid of his kinsmen, and, after a protracted encounter, described in language employed a hundred times before, kills his competitor. The whole of the sections called the Kailása Yátrá—or Kŕishńa's Journey to Kailása,—must have been wanting in the copy used by M. Langlois, as they are not included in his translation. The chapters of the Hari Vaḿśa,

---

* समुत्स्रक्ष्यामि ।

† आज्ञापूर्वं च यदिदमागच्छेति त्वयोदितम् ।
संपादयिष्ये श्वस्तुभ्यं तदप्येषोऽविलम्बितम् ॥

‡ संस्मृत्य, "calling to mind."

§ In the Sanskrit, Garutmat.

|| See Vol. IV., p. 113, note 1.

When the king of Káśi* heard of the preparations of Keśava, he sent his army (to the aid of Pauńdraka), himself bringing up the rear;† and, with the force of the king of Káśi,‡ and his own troops, Pauńdraka, the (false) Vásudeva, marched to meet Kŕishńa.§ Hari beheld him afar off, standing in his car, holding a discus, a club, a mace,|| a scimitar, and a lotos, in his hands; ornamented with a garland of flowers; bearing a bow; and having his standard made of gold. He had, also, the Śrívatsa¶ mark delineated on his breast; he was dressed in yellow garments, and decorated with ear-rings and a tiara.** When the god whose standard is Garuda beheld him, he laughed with a deep laugh, and engaged in conflict with the hostile host of cavalry and elephants, fighting with swords,†† scimitars,‡‡

---

according to his enumeration of them, are 261: my copy has 316.§§

---

* *Káśi-pati.* See note ‡, below.

† सर्वसैन्यपरीवारः पार्ष्णिग्राह उपाययौ।

Ratnagarbha defines पार्ष्णिग्राहः by सहायः, 'ally.' Compare Vol. IV., p. 2, text and note ¶.

‡ *Káśi-rája.* See Vol. IV., p. 344, supplementary note on p. 87.

§ The original has Keśava.

|| Probably the Translator forgot to strike out this word, after inserting 'club'. Kŕishńa has only four insignia, named, in the original, as follows:

चक्रहस्तं गदाखड्गबाहुं पाणिगताम्बुजम्।

For Kŕishńa's complete equipment of weapons, *vide infra*, p. 149.

¶ *Vide supra*, p. 13, text and note ‡. For the *śrivatsa* of the Jainas, see Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. II., p. 210.

** *Kiriťa.* †† *Nistriḿśa.* ‡‡ *Ŕishťi.*

§§ The Calcutta edition has 326; the Bombay edition, 317, in three Sections of 55, 128, and 134, severally.

maces, tridents,* spears,† and bows. Showering upon the enemy the shafts from his Śárnga‡ bow, and hurling at them his mace and discus, he§ quickly destroyed both the army of Pauńd́raka and that of the king of Káśi.|| He then said to the former, who was foolishly wearing his emblems: "Pauńd́raka, you desired me, by your envoy, to resign to you all my insignia. I now deliver them to you. Here is my discus. Here I give up my mace. And here is Garuda:¶ let him mount upon thy standard." Thus speaking, he let fly the discus and the mace, by which Pauńd́raka was cut to pieces, and cast on the ground; whilst the Garuda (on his banner) was demolished by the Garuda (of Vishńu). The people, beholding this sight, exclaimed "Alas! alas!" But the valiant king of Káśi,** adhering to the imposture of his friend, continued the conflict,†† till Śauri‡‡ decapitated him with his arrows, shooting his head into the city of Káśi,§§ to the marvel of all the inhabitants. Having, thus, slain Pauńd́raka and the king of Káśi,|||| with all their followers, Śauri returned

* *Śúla*, 'pikes'.

† *Śakti.*

‡ Corrected from "Śáranga", a mistake found in Professor Wilson's Hindu-made version.

§ Janárdana, in the original.

|| *Káśi-rája.*

¶ Garutmat, in the Sanskrit; and so twice, just below.

** काशीनामधिपः, "king of the Káśis," literally.

†† युयुधे वासुदेवेन मित्रस्यापचित्तौ स्थितः ।

The two commentators remark, in the same words: अपचित्तौ । आनृण्ये स्थितः सन्युयुधे ।

‡‡ This name does not appear in the original.

§§ *Káśi-puri*, "the city of the Káśis."

|||| *Káśi-rája.*

to Dwáraká,* where he lived in the enjoyment of heavenly delights.†

When the inhabitants of Káśi‡ saw the head of their king§ shot into their city, they were much astonished, and wondered how it could have happened, and by whom the deed could have been done.|| Having ascertained that the king had been killed by Kŕishńa,¶ the son of the monarch (of Káśi),[1] together with the priest of the family, propitiated Śankara; and that deity, well pleased to be adored in the sacred place** Avimukta,†† desired the prince to demand a boon. On which he prayed, and said: "O lord, mighty god, through thy favour, let thy mystic spirit‡‡ arise to destroy Kŕishńa, the murderer of my father." "It shall be so," answered Śankara. And from out of the southern fire§§ upsprang a vast and formidable female,[2] like flame out of

---

[1] The Bhágavata|||| names him Sudakshińa; the Padma, Dańdapáńi.

[2] A personified Kŕityá, a magical creation. The Padma has

---

* The Sanskrit has Dwáravati.

† पुनर्द्वारवतीं प्राप्तो रेमे स्वर्गगतो यथा ।

‡ Not literal.

§ *Káśi-pati.*

|| तच्छिरः पतितं दृष्ट्वा तत्र काशिपतेः पुरे ।
जनः किमेतदित्याह केनेत्यत्यन्तविस्मितः ॥

¶ Vásudeva, in the original.

** *Mahá-kshetra.*

†† This name of Benares is found in the *Káśi-khańda*, as well. It occurs, also, in the *Jábála Upanishad*. See my *Benares, &c.*, p. 4, note 2.

‡‡ "Thy mystic spirit" is to translate *kŕityá*, for which see note 2 in the present page.

§§ *Dakshińágni. Vide supra*, p. 114, note 1.

|||| X., Latter Section, XVI., 27.

fire, blazing with ruddy light, and with fiery radiance streaming amidst her hair.* Angrily she called upon Kŕishńa, and departed to Dwáraká;† where the people, beholding her, were struck with dismay, and fled, for protection, to Madhusúdana, the refuge of all worlds. The wielder of the discus,‡ knowing that the fiend § had been produced by the son of the king of Káśi,|| through his adoration of the deity whose emblem is a bull, and being engaged in sportive amusements, and playing at dice, said to the discus: "Kill this fierce creature,¶ whose tresses are of plaited flame." Accordingly, Sudarśana, the discus of Vishńu, immediately attacked the fiend,** fearfully enwreathed with fire, and wearing tresses of plaited flame.†† Terrified at the might of Sudarśana, the creation of Maheśwara‡‡ awaited not his attack, but fled with speed, pursued by him with equal velocity, until she reached Váráńasí, repelled by the superior might of the discus of Vishńu.

---

the same. The Bhágavata makes the product of the sacrificial fire a male, and sends him to Dwáraká, accompanied by a host of Bhútas, Śiva's attendant goblins.

---

* My MSS. present a great variety of readings in the epithets applied to the being under description.

† Dwáravatí, in the Sanskrit.

‡ *Chakrin.*

§ *Mahá-kŕityá.*

|| *Káśi-rája.*

¶ *Kŕityá.*

** *Kŕityá.*

†† This is far from literal; and the same may be said of the remainder of the paragraph.

‡‡ कृत्या माहेश्वरी ।

The army of Káśi,* and the host of the demigods attendant upon Śiva,† armed with all kinds of weapons, then sallied out, to oppose the discus; but, skilled in the use of arms, he consumed (the whole of) the forces by his radiance, and then set fire‡ to the city, in which the magic power of Śiva§ had concealed herself.[1] Thus was Váráńasí burnt, with all its princes and their followers, its inhabitants, horses, elephants, and men, treasures and granaries, houses, palaces,|| and markets.¶ The whole of a city that was inaccessible to the gods** was, thus, wrapped in flames by the discus of Hari, and was totally destroyed. The discus, then, with unmitigated wrath, and blazing fiercely, and far from satisfied with the accomplishment of so easy a task, returned to the hand of Vishńu.[2]††

---

[1] According to the Bhágavata, the magical being, himself, destroys Sudakshińa and his priest; but Sudarśana consumes the people and the city. The Padma ascribes the destruction of the king and all his city to the discus. The Hari Vaḿśa closes its narrative with the death of Pauńdraka, and makes no mention of the destruction of Benares. The circumstance‡‡ is alluded to, in a preceding section (s. 159), by Nárada, when detailing the exploits of Kŕishńa.

[2] In this legend, again, we have a contest between the followers

---

* *Káśi-bala*; which may mean either "the army of the Káśis" or "the army of the king of the Káśis."

† This phrase is to represent *pramatha*.

‡ दग्ध्वा implies combustion.

§ "The magic power of Śiva" is to render *kŕityá*.

|| *Prákára*. ¶ *Chatwara*.

** दुर्निरीक्ष्यां सुरैरपि ।

†† The latter portion of this paragraph is translated very freely.

‡‡ Namely, of the burning of Benares.

of Vishńu and Śiva intimated; as, besides the assistance given, by the latter, to Pauńdraka, Benares—Váráńasí or Avimukta,*—has been, from all time, as it is at present, the high place of the Śaiva worship.† There is, also, an indication of a Vaishńava schism, in the competition between Pauńdra and Kŕishńa for the title of Vásudeva and the insignia of his divinity.

---

* Corrected from "Atimukti". *Vide supra*, p. 126, text and note ††.

† See my *Benares*, &c., p. 18, note 2.

CHAPTER XXXV.

Sámba carries off the daughter of Duryodhana, but is taken prisoner. Balaráma comes to Hastinápura, and demands his liberation: it is refused: in his wrath, he drags the city towards him, to throw it into the river. The Kuru chiefs give up Sámba and his wife.

MAITREYA.—I have a (great) desire to hear, (excellent) Brahman, some further account of the exploits of Balaráma.* You have related to me his dragging the Yamuná,† and other mighty deeds; but you can tell me, venerable sir,‡ some other of his§ acts.

PARÁŚARA.— Attend, Maitreya, to the achievements performed by Ráma, who is the eternal, illimitable Śesha, the upholder of the earth. At the choice of a husband by the daughter|| of Duryodhana, the princess was carried off by the hero Sámba, the son of Jámbavatí.¶ Being pursued by Duryodhana,** Karńa,†† Bhíshma,‡‡ Drońa, and other celebrated chiefs, who were incensed at his audacity, he was defeated and taken prisoner.§§ When the Yádavas heard of the oc-

---

* Balabhadra, in the Sanskrit.

† *Vide supra*, pp. 65—68.

‡ *Mahábhága.*

§ Bala's, according to the original.

|| Her name was Lakshmańá, according to the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, X., Latter Section, XVIII., 1.

¶ *Vide supra*, p. 79, note ¶; and p. 107.

** See Vol. IV., p. 158.

†† *Ibid.*, pp. 102 and 126.

‡‡ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

§§ ततः क्रुद्धा महावीर्याः कर्णदुर्योधनादयः ।
भीष्मद्रोणादयश्चैनं बबन्धुर्युधि निर्जितम् ॥

The translation of this stanza, as will be seen, is considerably interpolated.

currence, their wrath was kindled against Duryodhana and his associates; and they prepared to take up arms against them.* But Baladeva,† in accents interrupted by the effects of ebriety,‡ forbade them, and said: "I will go, alone, to the sons of Kuru.§ They will liberate Sámba, at my request." Accordingly, he went to the elephant-styled city|| (Hastinápura), but took up his abode in a grove without the town, which he did not enter. When Duryodhana and the rest heard that he¶ had arrived there, they sent him a cow, a present of fruits and flowers, and water.** Bala received the offering in the customary form, and said to the Kauravas: "Ugrasena†† commands you to set Sámba at liberty." When Bhíshma, Drońa, Karńa, Duryodhana, and the others heard this, they were (very) angry; and Báhlíka‡‡ and other (friends of the) Kauravas, who looked upon the Yadu race as not entitled to regal dignity, said to the wielder of the club:§§ "What is this, Balabhadra, that thou hast uttered? What Yádava shall give orders to the chiefs of the family of Kuru?|||| If Ugrasena issues his mandates to the Kauravas, then

---

* चक्रुश्च तान्निहन्तुं महोद्यमम् ।

† The Sanskrit has Bala.

‡ मदलोलकलाक्षरम् ।

§ *Kaurava.*

|| I find two readings,—नगरं नागसाह्वयं and नगरं गजसाह्वयम् । For Hastinápura or Hástinapura, see Vol. IV., p. 139.

¶ Bala, in the original.

** गामर्घ्यमुदकं चैव रामाय प्रत्यवेदयन् ।

†† See Vol. IV., p. 98; also, *supra*, p. 45.

‡‡ See Vol. IV, p. 154, where correct "Váhlíka".

§§ *Musaláyudha.* *Vide supra*, p. 67, note **.

|||| See Vol. IV., pp. 148 and 152.

we must take away the white umbrella that he has usurped, and which is fit only for kings.* Depart, therefore, Balaráma.† You are entitled to our respect: but Sámba has been guilty of improper conduct; and we will not liberate him, either at Ugrasena's commands, or yours. The homage that is due to us, their superiors, by the Kukura‡ and Andhaka§ tribes, may not be paid by them. But who ever heard of a command issued by a servant to his master?|| Elevation to an equal seat has rendered you arrogant. We have committed a great mistake, in neglecting, through our friendship for you, the policy (that teaches the danger of treating the abject with deference).¶ Our sending you (to-day,) a respectful present** was an intimation

---

* तदलं पाण्डुरैश्छत्रैर्नृपयोग्यैर्विडम्बितैः ।

So reads Śrídhara, from whom Ratnagarbha differs, in ending the verse with अलंकृतैः ।

† Bala, in the Sanskrit.

‡ Corrected from "Kukkura". For Kukura, see Vol. IV., p. 97.

§ See Vol. IV., p. 96. Instead of the ordinary reading, कुकुरान्धकैः, my oldest and best MSS. of Ratnagarbha's text have कुरुबान्धवैः, "titular Kurus."

|| प्रणतिर्या कृतास्माकमार्याणां कुकुरान्धकैः ।
न नाम सा कृता केयमाज्ञा स्वामिनि भृत्यतः ॥

This is Śrídhara's reading. Ratnagarbha substitutes मान्यानां for आर्याणां, and भृत्यवत् for भृत्यतः । Also see note §, above. It is scarcely worth while to dwell on the Translator's misapprehension of this unimportant passage.

In the couplet cited occurs the word *árya*, in connexion with which the reader will, perhaps, pardon a digression. The reverse of *árya*, *anárya*, 'disreputable', has, in Hindí, become corrupted into *anári*, 'inexpert', 'artless', 'stupid'. It being assumed, further, by popular etymology, that *anári* is compounded of *a* and *nári*, we have, by the prefixing of *su*, 'good', to the latter, *sunári*, 'expert', 'knowing', 'clever'.

¶ को दोषो भवतां नीतिर्यत्प्रीत्या नावलोकिता ।

** *Argha.*

of (personal) regard, which it was neither fit for our race to have proffered, nor for yours to have expected."

Having thus spoken, the Kuru chiefs, unanimously refusing to set the son of Hari at large, immediately returned into the city.* Bala,† rolling about with intoxication, and the wrath which their contemptuous language had excited, struck the ground furiously with his heel, so that it burst to pieces with a loud sound that reverberated through the regions of space.‡ His eyes reddened with rage, and his brow was curved with frowns, as he exclaimed: "What arrogance is this, in such vile and pithless creatures! The sovereignty of the Kauravas, as well as our own, is the work of fate,§ whose decree it, also, is, that they now disrespect or disobey the commands of Ugrasena. Indra|| may, of right, give his orders to the gods; and Ugrasena exercises equal authority with the lord of Śachí. Fie upon the pride that boasts a throne the leavings of a hundred mortals!¶ Is not he the sovereign of the earth, the wives of whose servants adorn themselves with the blossoms of the Párijáta-tree? Ugrasena shall be the undisputed king of kings; for I will not return to his capital, until I have rid the world wholly of the sons of Kuru.** I will destroy Karńa,

* विविशुर्गजसाह्वयम् ।

† The original has Haláyudha.

‡ A free rendering; and so is the rest of the Chapter, generally.

§ *Kála.*

|| *Śachipati*, in the Sanskrit.

¶ धिङ्मनुष्यशतोच्छिष्टे तुष्टिरेषां नृपासने ।

So reads Śrídhara. Ratnagarbha begins the verse with धिङ्मानुषाणामुच्छिष्टे ।

** समस्तभूभुजां नाथ उग्रसेनः स तिष्ठतु ।
अद्य निष्कौरवामुर्वीं कृत्वा यास्यामि तत्पुरीम् ॥

Duryodhana, Drońa, Bhíshma, Báhlíka, Duhśáśana,* Bhúriśravas,† Somadatta,‡ Śala,§ Bhíma, Arjuna, Yudhishthira,|| the twins,¶ and all the other vile descendants of Kuru, with their horses, elephants, and chariots. I will rescue the hero Sámba from captivity, and carry him, along with his wife, to Dwáraká, where I shall again behold Ugrasena and the rest of my kin. Or, authorized by the king of the gods to remove the burthens of the earth, I will take this capital of the Kauravas,** with all the sons of Kuru, and cast the city of the elephant†† into the Bhágírathí."‡‡

So saying, the wielder of the club,§§ (Baladeva), his eyes red with rage, plunged the blade of his ploughshare|||| downwards, beneath the ramparts of the city,¶¶ and drew them towards him. When the Kauravas beheld Hastinápura tottering, they were much alarmed, and called loudly (on Ráma), saying: "Ráma, Ráma! Hold, hold! Suppress your wrath! Have mercy upon us! Here is Sámba, and his wife, also, delivered up to

---

* See Vol. IV., p. 158.

† Ratnagarbha's text introduces both Bhúri and Bhúriśravas.

‡ For Somadatta and his sons, Bhúri, Bhúriśravas, and Śala, see Vol. IV., p. 157.

§ Corrected from "Śalya", for which I find no authority. See note ‡, above; also, *supra*, p. 70, text and note **.

|| For these three personages, see Vol. IV., pp. 102 and 159.

¶ According to the commentators, Nakula and Sahadeva. See, for them, Vol. IV., pp. 103 and 159.

** *Kauravádháni.*

†† नगरं नागसाह्वयम् ।

‡‡ See Vol. III., p. 303.

§§ *Musaláyudha.* *Vide supra*, p. 67, note **.

|||| "The blade of his ploughshare" is to render *hala.* *Vide supra*, p. 51, note ||.

¶¶ *Prákára-vapra.*

thee. Forgive our sins, committed in ignorance of thy wondrous power."* Accordingly, issuing, hurriedly, from the city, the Kauravas delivered Sámba and his bride to the mighty Balaráma, who, bowing to Bhíshma, Droṅa, and Kṙipa,† who addressed him in conciliatory language, said "I am satisfied," and so desisted. The city bears the marks of the shock it received, even to the present day,—such was the might of Ráma,—proving both his strength and prowess. The Kauravas, then, offering homage to Sámba and to Bala,‡ dismissed the former, with his wife and a bridal portion.[1]

---

[1] This adventure is related in the Bhágavata, and very briefly noticed in the Hari Vaṁśa; but I have not found any mention of it in the Mahábhárata. It may have been suggested, originally, by Hastinápura having sustained some injury, either from an earthquake, or from the encroachments of the river, which, as is recorded, compelled the removal of the capital to Kauśámbí (Vol. IV., p. 164).

---

* अविज्ञातप्रभावाणां चम्यतामपराधिनाम् ।

† See Vol. IV., p. 147.

‡ Halin, in the Sanskrit. *Vide supra*, p. 84, note ¶. Halin means the same as Haláyudha, for which *vide supra*, p. 63, text and note ||.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

The Asura Dwivida, in the form of an ape, destroyed by Balaráma.

HEAR, also, Maitreya, another exploit performed by the mighty Balaráma.* The great Asura,† the foe of the friends of the gods, Naraka,‡ had a friend, of exceeding prowess, in the monkey named Dwivida, who was animated by implacable hostility against the deities, and vowed to revenge on the whole of them the destruction of Naraka by Kŕishńa, at the instigation of the king of the celestials, by preventing sacrifices, and effecting the annihilation of the mortal sphere. Blinded by ignorance, he, accordingly, interrupted all religious rites, subverted all righteous observances, and occasioned the death of living beings. He set fire to the forests, to villages, and to towns; sometimes he overwhelmed cities and hamlets with falling rocks; or, lifting up mountains in the waters,§ he cast them into the ocean: then, taking his place amidst the deep, he agitated the waves, until the foaming sea rose above its confines, and swept away the villages and cities situated upon its shores. Dwivida, also, who could assume what shape he would, enlarged his bulk to an immense size; and, rolling, and tumbling, and trampling amidst the cornfields, he crushed and spoiled

---

* Bala, in the original.

† *Asurendra.*

‡ *Vide supra*, pp. 87, *et seq.*

§ तोयेषु। Some MSS. have पोतेषु,—"in boats",—a reading noticed by Ratnagarbha.

the harvests.* The whole world, disordered by this iniquitous monkey, was deprived of sacred study † and religious rites,‡ and was greatly afflicted.

On one occasion, Haláyudha § was drinking in the groves of Raivata, along with the illustrious Revatí || and other beautiful females; and the distinguished Yadu, in whose praises songs were sung, and who was preeminent amidst graceful and sportive women, resembled Kubera, the god of riches, in his palace.¶ Whilst thus engaged, the monkey (Dwivida) came there, and, stealing the ploughshare** and the club of Baladeva,†† grinned at and mocked him,‡‡ and laughed at the women, and threw over and broke the cups filled with wine.§§ Balaráma,|||| becoming angry at this,

---

* कामरूपी महारूपं कृत्वा सस्यान्यशेषतः ।
लुठन्भ्रमणसंमर्दैः संचूर्णयति वानरः ।

† *Swádhyáya.*

‡ *Vashaṫkára.* See Vol. II., p. 29, note §; and Vol. III., p. 122, note †.

§ *Vide supra,* p. 63, note ||.

|| See Vol. III., p. 254.

¶ उपगीयमानो विलसल्ललनामौलिमध्यगः ।
रेमे यदुवरश्रेष्ठः कुबेर इव मन्दिरे ॥

So reads Śrídhara, according to the only copy of his commentary at my command. Both the scholiasts give the first line hypermetrical, as above; but Ratnagarbha has -लोक°, instead of -मौलि°. In lieu of Śrídhara's मन्दिरे, at the end of the stanza, I find, everywhere else, मन्दरे, "on Mandara". On this mountain was Chaitraratha, the garden of Kubera. See Vol. II., p. 110, note *; and Vol. IV., p. 6.

** *Hala.*

†† The Sanskrit has Sírin. See Vol. IV., p. 82, note †; and Vol. III., p. 332, note ¶. Sírin is the same as Halin, &c. *Vide supra*, p. 135, note ‡.

‡‡ चकारास्य संमुखं च विडम्बनम् ।

§§ पानपूर्णांश्च करकांश्चिक्षेपाहत्य वै पदा ।

For आहत्य, some MSS. have आहृत्य ।

|||| Bala, in the original.

threatened the monkey: but the latter disregarded his menaces, and made a chattering noise;* on which, Bala, starting up, seized his club, in wrath; and the monkey† laid hold of a large rock, which he hurled at the hero. Bala, casting his club at it, as it neared him, broke it into a thousand fragments, which, together with the club, fell upon the ground.‡ Beholding the club prostrate, the monkey sprang over it, and struck the Yádava violently on the breast with his paws. Bala replied with a blow of his fist upon the forehead§ of Dwivida, which felled him—vomiting blood, and lifeless,—to the earth. The crest of the mountain on which he fell was splintered into a hundred pieces by (the weight of) his body, as if the Thunderer|| had shivered it with his thunderbolt. The gods threw down a shower of flowers upon Ráma, and approached him, and praised him for the glorious feat he had performed. "Well has the world been freed," said they, "by thy prowess, O hero, of this vile ape, who was the ally of the enemy of the gods!"¶ Then they and their attendant spirits** returned, well pleased,

---

* चक्रे किलिकिलाध्वनिम् । Variants: किलकिल° and किलकिला° ।

† *Plavaga.*

‡ चिक्षेप च स तां क्षिप्तां मुसलेन सहस्रधा ।
बिभेद यादवश्रेष्ठः सा पपात महीतले ॥
आपतन्मुसलं चासौ समुल्लङ्घ्य प्लवंगमः ।
वेगेनागम्य रोषेण तलेनोरस्यताडयत् ॥

§ *Múrdhan.*

|| *Vajrin, i. e.,* Indra.

¶ *Daitya-pakshopakárin.*

** "Attendant spirits" is to render *guhyaka.* The Guhyakas attended on Kubera. See Vol. I., p. 122; Vol. III., p. 116, note †.

to heaven. Many such inimitable* deeds were wrought by the illustrious† Baladeva, (the impersonation of) Śesha, the supporter of the earth.[1]

---

[1] This exploit of Balaráma is, also, similarly, but more vulgarly, related in the Bhágavata. It is simply said, in the Hari Vaḿśa,‡—and erroneously,—that Mainda§ and Dwivida were conquered by Kŕishńa.

---

* *Aparimeya.*
† *Dhimat.*
‡ *Śl.* 9802.
§ Corrected from "Menda".

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Destruction of the Yádavas. Śámba and others deceive and ridicule the Ṛishis. The former bears an iron pestle: it is broken, and thrown into the sea. The Yádavas go to Prabhása, by desire of Kṛishńa: they quarrel and fight, and all perish. The great serpent Śesha issues from the mouth of Ráma. Kṛishńa is shot by a hunter, and again becomes one with universal spirit.

IN this manner did Kṛishńa, assisted by Baladeva, destroy demons* and iniquitous monarchs, for the good of the earth; and, along with Phálguna,[1] † also, did he‡ relieve earth of her load, by the death of innumerable hosts.§ Having, thus, lightened the burthens of the earth, and slain many (unrighteous princes), he exterminated, by the pretext of an imprecation denounced by Brahmans, his own (Yádava) race. Then, quitting Dwáraká, and relinquishing his mortal being,‖

[1] A name of Arjuna, the great friend of Kṛishńa, to whom the latter served as charioteer, in the war between the Páńdus and Kurus.

* *Daitya.*

† For the various names of Arjuna, and their origin, see the *Mahábhárata*, *Viráta-parvan*, *śl.* 1375, *et seq.*

‡ The original here names Hari.

§ समस्ताक्षौहिणीवधात् । For *akshauhińí*, *vide supra*, p. 50, notes 2 and **.

‖ My Arrah MS. here inserts as follows:

त्यक्त्वा मानुष्यकं भावं देवदेवो जतार्दनः ।
कृत्वा चान्यानि कार्याणि देवानां हितकाम्यया ॥
दुर्योधनस्य विप्रर्षे युधिष्ठिरपुरोगमैः ।
पाण्डवैर्भेदमुत्पन्नमुपेक्षत विभुस्तदा ॥

the self-born reentered, with all his emanations,[1] his own sphere of Vishńu.*

Maitreya.—Tell me how Janárdana effected the destruction of his own race, under the plea of Brahmanical imprecation; and in what manner he relinquished his mortal body.[2]

Paráśara.—At the holy place† Pińdáraka,[3]‡ Viśwámitra,§ Kańwa,|| and the great sage Nárada were

---

[1] With Balaráma, Pradyumna, Aniruddha, and the rest.

[2] The legend of the destruction of the Yádava race and the death of Kŕishńa appears, probably, in its earliest extant form, in the Mausala Parvan of the Mahábhárata. It forms the narrative portion of the Eleventh Book of the Bhágavata; having been previously briefly adverted to in the First and Third Books; and it is summarily told in the Uttara Khańda of the Padma Puráńa,

[3] The village of Pińdáraka, still held in veneration, is situated in Gujerat, about twenty miles from the north-west extremity of the Peninsula. Hamilton, Vol. I., p. 664.

अन्वमोदत्ततः कृष्णस्ततो वैरमकारयत् ।
तत्र हत्वा कुरून्सर्वान्पाण्डवैर्यैः परस्परम् ।
जगाम निर्वृतिं देवो जगतां पतिरीश्वरः ।
अक्षौहिण्यो हतास्तत्र अष्टादश महामुने ॥

A second of my copies gives the same verses, with the variation of only three words.

It is not palpable that this passage is an interpolation. The first line of it does not repeat the sense of what immediately precedes it,—Professor Wilson's "relinquishing his mortal body",—the Sanskrit of which is त्यक्त्वा मानुष्यं, *i. e.*, according to both the commentators, मनुष्यनाट्यं, "personation of man."

* सांशो विष्णुमयं स्थानं प्रविवेश पुनर्निजम् ।

† *Mahá-tirtha.*

‡ Connected, perhaps, with Pińdáraka, son of Vasudeva and Rohińí. See Vol. IV., p. 109, text and note ‡‡.

§ See Vol. III., p. 14, note 1, near the end.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 57.

observed by some boys of the Yadu tribe. Giddy with youth, and influenced by predestined results,* they dressed and adorned Sámba, the son of Jámbavatí, as a damsel; and, conducting her to the sages, they addressed them with the usual marks of reverence, and said: "What child will this female, the wife of Babhru,† who is anxious to have a son, give birth to?" The sages, who were possessed of divine wisdom, were very angry to find themselves thus tricked by the boys, and said: "She will bring forth a club, that shall crush the whole of the Yádava race." The boys, thus spoken to by the sages, went and related all that had occurred to Ugrasena; and (as foretold,) a club was produced from the belly of Sámba. Ugrasena had the club—which was of iron,—ground to dust, and thrown into the sea; but the particles of dust (there) became rushes.[1] There

[1] The term is Eraká (एरका), which is explained, in some medical lexicons, "a kind of grass." The commentator‡ also calls it a kind of grass; and, in the text of the Mahábhárata, the term subsequently used, and as synonymous with it, is Trińa (तृण), 'grass.' The Mahábhárata, when describing the affray which follows, mentions, that the grass, or rushes, on being plucked by Kŕishńa and the Yádavas, turn to clubs. The text, and that of the Bhágavata, here say, that the powdered particles, floating on the sea, became rushes. Or the latter may imply, that they fastened upon grass or weeds. The commentator, however, explains, that, the particles of iron being borne to land, they were so transformed. The Mahábhárata says nothing of the piece

* भाविकार्यप्रचोदिताः ।

† See Vol. IV, p. 72.

‡ एरकाः । धारात्रयोपेतास्तृणभेदाः । Śrídhara. एरकाः । त्रिधारतृणविशेषाः । Ratnagarbha.

was one part of the iron club which was like (the blade of) a lance,* and which the Andhakas could not break.† This, when thrown into the sea, was swallowed by a fish: the fish was caught, the iron spike was extracted from its belly, and was taken by a hunter named Jaras.‡ The all-wise§ and glorious Madhusúdana did not think fit to counteract what had been predetermined by fate.

Then there came to Keśava, when he was private and alone, a messenger from the gods, who addressed him with reverence, and said: "I am sent to you, O lord, by the deities. And do thou hear what Indra,|| together with the Viśwas,¶ Aświns,** Maruts, Ádityas, Rudras, and Sádhyas, respectfully represents. "More than a hundred years have elapsed since thou, in favour to the gods,†† hast descended upon earth, for

---

which could not be pounded; and this seems to be an embellishment, either of our text or the Bhágavata. The Mahábhárata, however, adds another precaution, which the two others have left unnoticed. Ugrasena causes a proclamation to be made, that none of the inhabitants of Dwáraká shall, thenceforth, drink wine, on pain of being impaled alive; and the people, for some time, observe the prohibition.

---

* *Tomara.*

† The original yields 'triturate': चूर्णयितुं शेकुर्न ।

‡ Corrected from "Jará". *Vide infra*, p. 152, note ‡.

§ विज्ञातपरमार्थः ।

|| Śakra, in the Sanskrit.

¶ *Vide supra*, p. 101, note *. Ratnagarbha reads 'Vasus'. My Ajmere MS. yields "Ádityas, Rudras, Sádhyas, Aświns, Vasus, Agnis, Maruts, &c.," and in this order.

** I have inserted this word, inadvertently omitted by the Translator.

†† त्रिदशैः संप्रसादितः ।

the purpose of relieving it of its load. The demons* have been slain, and the burthen of earth has been removed. Now let the immortals once again behold their monarch in heaven.† A period exceeding a century has passed. Now, if it be thy pleasure, return to Swarga. This is the solicitation of the celestials. But, should such not be thy will, then remain here as long as it may be desirable to thy dependants."[1]‡ To this, Kŕishńa replied:§ "All that thou hast said I am well aware of. The destruction of the Yádavas by me has commenced. The burthens of the earth are not removed, until the Yádavas are extirpated. I will effect this, also, in my descent, and quickly; for it shall come to pass in seven nights. When I have restored the land of Dwáraká to the ocean, and annihilated the race of Yadu, I will proceed to the mansions of the immortals. Apprise the gods, that, having abandoned my human body, and accompanied by Sankarshańa, I will then return to them.|| The tyrants that oppressed the earth,

---

[1] Nothing of this kind occurs in the Mahábhárata. Our text, therefore, offers an embellishment. The Bhágavata, again, improves upon the text; for, not content with a messenger, it makes Brahmá (with the Prajápatis), Śiva (with the Bhútas), Indra (with the other divinities), all come, in person; indicating, evidently, a

---

* *Daitya.*

† त्वया सनाथास्त्रिदशा भवन्तु त्रिदिवे पुनः ।

‡ देवैर्विज्ञाप्यते चेदमथात्रैव रतिस्तव ।
तत्स्थीयतां यथाकालमाख्येयमनुजीविभिः ॥

§ श्रीभगवानुवाच ।

|| मानुषं देहमुत्सृज्य संकर्षणसहायवान् ।
प्राप्त एवास्मि मन्तव्यो देवेन्द्रेण तथा सुरैः ॥

—Jarásandha and the rest,—have been killed; and a youth, even, of the race of Yadu, is, no less than they, an incumbrance. When, therefore, I have taken away this great weight upon earth, I will return to protect the sphere of the celestials.* Say this to them." The messenger of the gods, having received this reply, bowed, and took his heavenly course to the king of the gods.

The mighty (Kŕishńa) now beheld signs and portents,† both in earth and heaven, prognosticating, day and night, the ruin of Dwáraká.[1] Showing these to the

later date, as plainly as the addition of the text shows it to be subsequent to the date of the legend in the Mahábhárata.

[1] The Mahábhárata, which delights in describing portents and signs, does not fail to detail them here. A dreadful figure, death personified, haunts every house, coming and going no one knows how, and being invulnerable to the weapons by which he is assailed. Strong hurricanes blow; large rats multiply, and infest the roads and houses, and attack persons in their sleep; Sárikás (or starlings,) utter inauspicious screams in their cages; storks imitate the hooting of owls; and goats, the howling of jackals; cows bring forth foals; and camels, mules; food, in the moment of being eaten, is filled with worms; fire burns with discoloured flames; and, at sunset and sunrise, the air is traversed by headless and hideous spirits. There is more to the same effect, which neither our text nor the Bhágavata has ventured to detail. The whole passage has been published in Maurice's Ancient History of Hindustan, Vol. II., p. 463; translated, apparently, by the late Sir Charles Wilkins. The names have been much disfigured either by the copyist or compositor.

* *Amara-loka.*

† "Signs and portents" is to render *utpáta.*

Yádavas, he said: "See! Behold these fearful phenomena! Let us hasten to Prabhása, to avert these omens."* When he had thus spoken to the eminent Yádava,† the illustrious Uddhava‡ saluted and said to him: "Tell me, O lord, what it is proper that I should do. For it seems to me, that thou wilt destroy all this race. The signs (that are manifest) declare (nothing less than) the annihilation of the tribe." Then Kŕishńa§ replied to him: "Do you go by a celestial route, which my favour shall provide you, to the holy (place) Badarikáśrama,|| in the Gandhamádana mountain, the shrine of Naranáráyańa;¶ and, on that spot, sanctified by them, thou, by meditating on me, shalt obtain perfection,** through my favour. When the race (of Yadu) shall have perished, I shall proceed to heaven; and the ocean shall inundate Dwáraká, when I have quitted it." Accordingly, Uddhava, thus instructed†† by Keśava, saluted him with veneration, and departed to the shrine of Naranáráyańa.[1]

---

[1] In the Mahábhárata, it is said, merely, that Uddhava, who was versed in Yoga, foreseeing the destruction of the Yádavas,

---

* शमायैषां प्रभासं याम मा चिरम्।

† एवमुक्ते तु कृष्णेन यादवप्रवरस्ततः।

This verse is recognized by Śrídhara, but not by Ratnagarbha; and the sense is complete without it. My Ajmere MS. gives it; my Arrah MS. omits it.

‡ See Vol. IV., p. 113, notes 1 and ‡.

§ Bhagavat, in the original.

|| Ratnagarbha calls this hermitage by its shorter name, Badarí, instead of Badariká, the form preferred by Śrídhara.

¶ We have already had mention of it. *Vide supra*, p. 62.

** *Siddhi.*

†† *Anumodita.*

Then the Yádavas ascended their rapid cars, and drove to Prabhása,[1] along with Kŕishńa, Ráma, and the rest of their chiefs.[2] They bathed there; and, excited* by Vásudeva, the Kukuras† and Andhakas indulged in liquor. As they drank, the destructive flame of dissension was kindled amongst them by mutual collision, and fed with the fuel of abuse. Infuriated by the divine influence, they fell upon one another with missile weapons;‡ and, when those were expended, they had recourse to the rushes § growing nigh. The rushes in their hands became like thunderbolts; and they struck one another, with them, fatal|| blows.

---

went away; that is, according to the commentator, he practised penance, and went to heaven: जगाम योगमास्थाय परलोकम् । The Bhágavata, taking the hint, makes much more of it than our text, and expands it into a long course of instruction, given by Kŕishńa to Uddhava, occupying 150 leaves.

[1] *Vide supra*, p. 47, note 2. By sending the Yádavas to Prabhása, (the commentator asserts,) Kŕishńa prevented, purposely, the Yádavas from obtaining Mukti, 'final liberation', which would have been the consequence of dying at Dwáraká. Death at Prabhása conferred only Indra's heaven.

[2] The Mahábhárata describes them as going forth with horses, elephants, and cars, and their women and abundance of good cheer, and varieties of wine and meat:

बहुनानाविधं चक्रुर्मद्यं मांसमनेकशः ।

---

* *Anumodita.*

† Corrected, here and frequently elsewhere, from "Kukkuras".

‡ *Śastra*, which almost always signifies an edged weapon, in contradistinction from *astra*, 'a missile weapon'.

§ *Eraká.* *Vide supra*, p. 142, note 1.

|| *Sudáruńa.*

Pradyumna, Sámba, Kŕitavarman,* Sátyaki,† Aniruddha, Pŕithu, Vipŕithu,‡ Cháruvarman,§ Cháruka,‖ Akrúra, and many others struck one another with the rushes, which had assumed the hardness of thunderbolts[1]. Keśava interposed, to prevent them; but they thought that he was taking part with each, severally,

---

[1] The Bhágavata, like the text, adverts only in this general manner to the conflict; but the Mahábhárata gives the particulars. Yuyudhána¶ reproaches Kŕitavarman with having aided Aśwatthámán** in his night-attack on the Pándu camp, and killing warriors in their sleep. Pradyumna joins in the abuse. Kŕitavarman retorts. Kŕishńa looks at him angrily Sátyaki repeats the story of the Syamantaka gem, by which he accuses Kŕitavarman of being an accomplice in the murder of Sattrájita†† (See Vol. IV., pp. 75, *et seq.*). Satyabhámá,‡‡ the daughter of the latter, then mixes in the quarrel, and incites Kŕishńa to avenge her; but Sátyaki anticipates him, and murders Kŕitavarman. Śaineya§§ and the Bhojas attack Sátyaki; the Andhakas defend him; and the affray becomes general. Kŕishńa attempts to part the combatants, until Pradyumna is killed; and, then, taking up a handful of rushes, which become an iron club, he kills, indiscriminately, all that come in his way. The conflict continues, until the greater part of the combatants have fallen, including all Kŕishńa's sons; and he then, in wrath, sweeps off all the survivors, except Babhru and Dáruka, with his discus.

---

* See Vol. IV., p. 99.

† *Ibid.*, p. 93.

‡ For these two brothers, see Vol. IV., p. 96.

§ I know nothing of him. In Vol. IV., p. 113, we have a Sucháru. One of my MSS. has Chárudharman.

‖ The same as Cháru, for whom see p. 78, *supra*.

¶ The same as Sátyaki. See Vol. IV., p. 93.

** See Vol. IV., p. 147.

†† Corrected from "Satrajit".

‡‡ See Vol. IV., p. 80.

§§ Was this Satyaka, Sátyaki's father? See Vol. IV., p. 92.

and continued the conflict. Kŕishńa, then, enraged, took up a handful of rushes, to destroy them; and the rushes became a club of iron. And with this he slew many of the murderous Yádavas; whilst others, fighting fiercely, put an end to one another. The chariot of the holder of the discus,* named Jaitra, was quickly carried off by the (swift) steeds, and swept away by the sea, in the sight of Dáruka, (the charioteer). The discus, the club, the bow, the quiver, the shell, and the sword † (of Keśava), having circumambulated their lord,‡ flew along the path of the sun. In a short time there was not a single Yádava left alive, except the mighty Kŕishńa and Dáruka.[1] Going towards Ráma, who was sitting at the root of a tree, they beheld a large serpent coming out of his mouth. Having issued from his mouth, the mighty § snake proceeded towards

---

[1] The Mahábhárata, as observed at the end of the last note, adds Babhru; but it presently gets rid of him. Kŕishńa sends him to take care of the old people, the women, and children, in Dwáraká, whilst Dáruka goes to bring Arjuna to their aid. But, as he goes along,—overcome with grief for the loss of his kindred, and approaching separation from Kŕishńa,—he is killed by a club that is cast from a snare, or trap, set by a hunter. Kŕishńa then goes to Dwáraká, and desires Vasudeva to await the coming of Arjuna; after which, he returns to Ráma, and sees the phenomenon described in the text; the serpent being Śesha, of whom Balaráma was the incarnation. The Bhágavata does not mention this incident; merely observing, that Ráma, by the power of Yoga, returned into himself,—that is, into Vishńu.

---

* *Chakrin.*

† *Vide supra*, p. 124; also, a passage towards the end of Chapter VII. of Book VI.

‡ Hari, in the Sanskrit.

§ *Mahábhoga.*

the ocean, hymned by saints,* and by other great serpents. Bringing an offering of respect, Ocean came to meet him; and, then, the majestic being, adored by attendant snakes, entered into the waters of the deep.† Beholding the departure of (the spirit of) Balabhadra,‡ Keśava said to Dáruka: "All this is to be related, by you, to Vasudeva and Ugrasena. Go and inform them of the departure of Balabhadra, and the destruction of the Yádavas; also, that I shall engage in religious meditation, and quit this body. Apprise Áhuka,§ and all the inhabitants of Dwáraká,[1] that the sea will inundate the town. Be ready, therefore, in expectation of the coming of Arjuna; and, when he‖ quits Dwáraká, no longer abide there, but go whithersoever that descendant of Kuru shall repair. Do you, also, go to the son of Kuntí,¶ and tell him, that it is my request that he will grant what protection he can to all my family.

[1] The women, the elders, and the children, amongst whom, as we shall presently see, was Vajra, the son of Aniruddha,** who was established as chief of the Yádavas at Indraprastha, and who, therefore, escaped the destruction which overwhelmed their kinsmen, the Vŕishńis, Kukuras, and Andhakas, of Dwáraká. This was a fortunate reservation for the tribes which, in various parts of Hindusthan,—both on the Ganges and in the Deccan,—profess to derive their origin from the Yádavas.††

* *Siddha.*

† प्रविवेश च तत्तोयं पूजितः पन्नगोत्तमैः ।

‡ Bala, in the original.

§ Father of Ugrasena. See Vol. IV., p. 98.

‖ Here called Páńdava, in the Sanskrit.

¶ Kaunteya; namely, Arjuna. See Vol. IV., pp. 101, 102, and 159.

** *Vide supra*, p. 108, text and note *.

†† See Vol. IV., p. 58, notes 2 and §.

Then depart, with Arjuua and all the people of Dwáravatí; and let Vajra be installed sovereign over the tribe of Yadu."*

Dáruka, being thus instructed, prostrated himself, again and again, before Kŕishńa, and walked round him repeatedly, and then departed, as he had been desired; and, having conducted Arjuna to Dwáravatí,† the intelligent (servant of Kŕishńa) established Vajra as king. The divine Govinda, then, having concentrated in himself that supreme spirit‡ which is one with Vásudeva, was identified with all beings.[1] Respecting the words of the Brahman,—the imprecation of Durvásas,[2] §—the

---

[1] The process is explained by the commentator:|| "By the force of Dhyána (or abstraction), Kŕishńa satisfies himself that he is Brahma (ब्रह्मैवाहमिति ध्यात्वा), or universal spirit; and is, next, convinced, that he is, therefore, all things (सर्वभूतान्यप्यहमेव); by which his individuality ceases."

[2] The story is told in the Mahábhárata.¶ Durvásas was, on one occasion, hospitably entertained by Kŕishńa; but the latter omitted to wipe away the fragments of the meal which had fallen on the foot of the irascible sage, who, thereupon, foretold, that Kŕishńa should be killed as in the text.

---

* वज्रस्य यदुराज्येऽभिषिच्यताम्। So Śrídhara. Ratnagarbha reads: वज्रस्य यदुराजो भविष्यति।

† Corrected, here and just above, from "Dwárávatí". The original has Dwáraká.

‡ परं ब्रह्म।

§ दुर्वासा यदुवाच। See, for Durvásas, Vol. I., pp. 135 and 154.

|| What follows is taken from Śrídhara, whose words are: आत्मनि परं ब्रह्म समारोप्य ब्रह्मैवाहमिति ध्यात्वा तमात्मानं सर्वभूतेष्वधारयत्सर्वभूतान्यप्यहमेवेति दध्यावित्यर्थः। Ratnagarbha comments to the same effect.

¶ And it is told briefly by both the commentators on the *Vishńu-puráńa*.

illustrious Kŕishńa * sat engaged in thought, † resting his foot upon his knee. Then came there a hunter, named Jaras,[1] ‡ whose arrow was tipped with a blade made of the piece of iron of the club, which had not been reduced to powder; § and, beholding, from a distance, the foot of Kŕishńa, he mistook it for part of a deer, and, shooting his arrow, lodged it in the sole.[2] || Approaching (his mark), he saw the four-armed king, and, falling at his feet, repeatedly besought his forgiveness, exclaiming: "I have done this deed unwittingly, thinking I was aiming at a deer. Have pity upon me, who am consumed by my crime! For thou art able to consume me." ¶ Bhagavat replied: "Fear

---

[1] This is an allegorical personage, however; for Jará signifies 'infirmity', 'old age', 'decay.' **

[2] The Bhágavata explains how this part of the foot became exposed. Kŕishńa had assumed one of the postures in which abstraction is practised. He had laid his left leg across his right thigh, by which the sole of the foot was turned outwards.

---

* This name and its epithet are supplied by the Translator.

† योगयुक्तः ।

‡ Corrected from "Jará", which the original cannot yield, as a huntress would be called *lubdhakí*. The original is as follows:

आययौ च जरा नाम स तदा तत्र लुब्धकः ।

Compare note ‡ in p. 143, *supra*. Also see the *Mahábhárata*, *Mausala-parvan*, *śl.* 126, *et seq.*

§ मुसलावशेषलोहैकसायकन्यस्ततोमरः ।

This compound is descriptive of लुब्धकः ।

|| A free translation.

¶ क्षम्यतामात्मपापेन दग्धं मां दग्धुमर्हसि ।

Ratnagarbha begins this verse with the words क्षम्यतां नात्मपापेन ।

** To this speculation it is difficult to assent. See note ‡, above.

not, thou, in the least.* Go, hunter, through my favour, to heaven, the abode of the gods." As soon as he had thus spoken, a celestial car appeared; and the hunter, ascending it, forthwith proceeded to heaven. Then the illustrious (Kŕishńa), having united himself with his own pure, spiritual,† inexhaustible, inconceivable, unborn, undecaying, imperishable,‡ and universal spirit, which is one with Vásudeva, abandoned his mortal body and the condition of the threefold qualities.[1]§

[1] He became Nirguńa, 'devoid of all qualities.'||

* न तेऽस्ति भयमण्वपि ।

† *Brahma-bhúta.*

‡ The epithet *aprameya*, 'boundless', is here omitted.

§ तत्याज मानुषं देहमतीत्य त्रिविधां गतिम् ।

|| Thus explain both Śrídhara and Ratnagarbha.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Arjuna comes to Dwáraká, and burns the dead, and takes away the surviving inhabitants. Commencement of the Kali age. Shepherds and thieves attack Arjuna, and carry off the women and wealth. Arjuna regrets the loss of his prowess, to Vyása, who consoles him, and tells him the story of Ashťávakra's cursing the Apsarasas. Arjuna and his brothers place Parikshit on the throne, and go to the forests. End of the Fifth Book.

ARJUNA, having found the bodies of Kŕishńa and of Ráma, performed, for them and the rest (of the slain), the obsequial rites.* The eight queens of Kŕishńa, who have been named,† with Rukmińí at their head,‡ embraced the body of Hari, and entered the (funeral) fire.[1] Revatí, also, embracing the corpse of Ráma, entered the blazing pile, which was cool to her, happy in contact with her lord.§ Hearing these events, Ugrasena and Ánakadundubhi, with Devakí and Rohińí, committed themselves to the flames.[2] The

---

[1] The Mahábhárata takes the wives of Kŕishńa, first, to Indraprastha; and there Rukmińí and four others burn. But Satyabhámá and others become ascetics, going to perform Tapasya in the forest.

[2] It is merely said, in the Mahábhárata, that Vasudeva expired; on which, four of his wives burnt themselves.

---

* "Obsequial rites" is to render *saḿskára*.

† *Vide supra*, pp. 78, *et seq.*, and p. 107.

‡ रुक्मिणीप्रमुखाः, "Rukmińí and the rest."

§ विवेश ज्वलितं वह्निं तत्संगाह्लादशीतलम् ।

last ceremonies* were performed, for all these, by Arjuna, who, then, made all the people leave the city, and took Vajra with him. The son of Kuntí† conducted the thousands of the wives of Kŕishńa, with Vajra and all the people, from Dwáraká,‡ with tenderness and care, and travelled slowly away. The Sudharman§ palace and the Párijáta-tree, which had been brought to earth by Kŕishńa, both proceeded to heaven; and, on the same day that Hari departed from the earth, the powerful dark-bodied|| Kali (age) descended.[1] The ocean (rose and) submerged the whole of Dwáraká, except alone the dwelling of the deity of the race of Yadu.¶ The sea has not yet been able to wash that (temple) away; and there Keśava constantly abides, (even in the present day). Whoever visits that holy shrine—the place where Kŕishńa pursued his sports,— is liberated from all his sins.[2]**

---

[1] The Kali age commenced from the death of Kŕishńa, according to the usual notions; but it is commonly supposed to commence a little later, or with the reign of Parikshit. ††

[2] The Bhágavata agrees with the text, in excepting the temple of Dwáraká, and asserting that it still remains, in direct contradiction of the Mahábhárata, which declares, that the sea did not spare any part whatever. It is clear, therefore, that, when the latter was compiled, the temple was not standing, and that it was

---

* *Preta-kárya.*

† Kaunteya. *Vide supra*, p. 150, note ¶.

‡ Dwáravatí, in the Sanskrit.

§ *Vide supra*, p. 46, text and note *.

|| *Kála-káya.* There are three unimportant variants. Ratnagarbha notes and elucidates two of them.

¶ यदुदेवगृहं, "the temple of the Yadus."

** This sentence greatly abridges the original.

†† See Vol. IV, p. 230, note *, and p. 233.

The son of Ṕithá* (Arjuna,) halted the people (he had brought from Dwáraká,) in the Panchanada country,[1] in a rich and fertile spot. But the desires of the robbers (of the neighbourhood) were excited, when they observed so many widowed females,—also, such great riches,—in the possession of Arjuna* alone.†

erected between the date of the compilation and that of the two Puráńas. The present shrine, which is held in great repute, stands at the extremity of the peninsula of Gujerat. It is still an object of pilgrimage. It was so in the reign of Akbar (Ayeen Akbaree); and has been so, no doubt, from a remote period. The image formerly worshipped there was carried off 600 years ago; and this was, most probably, subsequent to the date of both the Puráńas: for the idol was a form of Kŕishńa, called Rańachhoŕ,—a popular divinity, unknown in the Pauráńik pantheon. Another image was substituted in place of that which was taken away. Notwithstanding the testimony of our text, and that of the Bhágavata, the originality of the temple is disputed; and a place thirty miles south from Poorbundur is said to be the spot where Dwáraká was swallowed up by the ocean. Hamilton (from Macmurdo, &c.), Vol. I., p. 662.

[1] "The country of the five rivers,"‡ the Punjab:—rather an out-of-the-way route from Dwáraká to Dehli.

* Pártha, in the original. See Vol. IV., pp. 101, 102.

† ततो लोभः समभवद्दस्यूनां निहतेश्वराः ।
दृष्ट्वा स्त्रियो नीयमानाः पार्थेनैकेन धन्विना ॥

Ratnagarbha reads as follows:

ततो लोभः समभवत्पार्थेनैकेन धन्विना ।
दृष्ट्वा स्त्रियो नीयमाना दस्यूनां निहतेश्वराः ॥

And herewith agree my Ajmere and Arrah MSS.

In no MS. do I find, in lieu of धन्विना, धनिना, which might suggest Professor Wilson's "such great riches."

‡ The original is पञ्चनदे देशे. Most probably the *tírtha* called Panchanada is intended; for which see the *Mahábhárata*, *Vana-parvan*, *śl.* 5025, 5086; and elsewhere.

Inflamed by their cupidity, they assembled the villainous Ábhíras,[1]* and said to them: "Here is this Arjuna,—immensely rich,† and having numerous women, whose husbands have been slain,—passing confidently amongst us; a disgrace to all brave men.‡ His pride is raised by the death of Bhíshma, Drońa, Jayadratha, Karńa, and others (whom he has slain). He does not know the prowess of (simple) villagers. Up! up! Take your long thick staves.§ This stupid fellow despises us. Why should we not lift up our arms?" So saying, they rushed, armed with cudgels and clods of earth,||

[1] Ábhíras mean 'herds;'¶ and they are, afterwards, called, by Arjuna, Gopálas, 'herdsmen.' The pastoral tribes of the west of India, and, particularly, those of Afghanistan, almost always combine the character of freebooter with that of shepherd.

---

* ततस्ते पापकर्माणो लोभोपहतचेतसः ।
आभीरा मन्त्रयामासुः समेत्यात्यन्तदुर्मदाः ॥

† I find, everywhere, धन्वी, 'archer.' See note ‡ in the preceding page.

‡ अयमेकोऽर्जुनो धन्वी स्त्रीजनं निहतेश्वरम् ।
नयत्यस्मानतिक्रम्य धिगेतद्भवतां बलम् ॥

Instead of भवतां, क्रियतां is preferred by Ratnagarbha, according to my oldest copy of his commentary. And so reads my Arrah MS.

My Ajmere MS. gives, in the place of the verse beginning as above, a whole stanza, and one of very different import.

§ हे हे यष्टीर्महायामा गृह्णीत । Ratnagarbha has महामाया ।

|| Nothing to yield "clods of earth" is read in the text as alone I find it:

ततो यष्टिप्रहरणा दस्यवो लोष्ट्रहारिणः ।
सहस्रशोऽभ्यधावन्त तं जनं निहतेश्वरम् ॥

Śridhara and Ratnagarbha: यष्टिप्रहरणाः । दण्डायुधाः । लोष्ट्रहारिणः । परस्वग्राहिणः । Professor Wilson must have supposed that the reading was लोष्टहारिणः ।

¶ I know no authority for this meaning. For the Ábhíras, see Vol. II., p. 168, notes 4, *etc.*; p. 185, notes 2, *etc.*

upon the people, who were without their lord.* Arjuna† encountered‡ them, and said to them, in derision: "Retire, wretches, ignorant of what is right, unless ye are desirous of dying." But they disregarded his menaces, and seized his treasures, and his women,—the wives of Viśwaksena. Thereupon, Arjuna began to brace his heavenly bow, Gáńdíva, irresistible§ in battle. But it was in vain; for, in spite of all his efforts to tighten it, it continued flaccid. Neither could he call to recollection the incantations of the superhuman weapons.‖ Losing all patience, he launched, as best he might, his shafts upon the enemy; but those shot from Gáńdíva merely scratched the skin. The arrows given him, by Agni,¶ to carry certain destruction,** now were, themselves, destroyed, and were fatal to Arjuna, in his contest with herdsmen. He endeavoured to recall the might of Kŕishńa,—animated by which, his numerous arrows had overthrown mighty kings;—but he tried in vain: for, now, they were put aside by the peasants;†† or they flew at random, wide of their aim.‡‡ His arrows being expended, he§§ beat the ban-

* The widows above spoken of are intended.

† Kaunteya, in the Sanskrit. *Vide supra*, p. 150, note ¶.

‡ निवृत्य; implying that Arjuna desisted from encountering the Ábhíras.

§ *Ajara.*

‖ न सस्मार तथास्त्राणि चिन्तयन्नपि पाण्डवः ।

¶ In the original, Vahni.

** The epithet thus rendered is *akshaya*, 'indestructible.'

†† *Ábhíra.*

‡‡ अचिन्तयच्च कौन्तेयः कृष्णस्यैव हि तद्बलम् ।
यन्मया शरसंघातैः सकला भूभुजो जिताः ॥
मिषतः पाण्डुपुत्रस्य ततस्ताः प्रमदोत्तमाः ।
आभीरैरपकृष्यन्ते कामाच्चान्याः प्रवव्रजुः ।

§§ Here Arjuna is called Dhananjaya, in the original.

ditti with the horn of his bow: but they only laughed at his blows; and the barbarians,* in the sight of Arjuna,† carried off all the women of the Vríshńi and Andhaka tribes, and went their way.[1]

Then Jishńu‡ was sorely distressed, and lamented bitterly, exclaiming: "Alas! alas! I am deserted by my lord!" And he wept; and, in that instant, the bow and (heavenly) arms, his car and steeds, perished entirely, like a donation to an unlearned Brahman.§ "Resistless," said he, "are the decrees of fate, by whom feebleness has been inflicted upon me,—deprived of my illustrious friend,—and victory given to the base.‖ These two arms are mine; mine is this fist; this is my place;¶ I am Arjuna: but, without that righteous aid, all these are pithless. The valour of Arjuna,** the strength of Bhíma,†† was, all, his work; and, without him, I am overcome by peasants:‡‡ it cannot be from any other

[1] The principal wives of Kríshńa, however, according to the Mahábhárata, escaped. The occurrence is described, there, much in the same way, but more briefly. It is not detailed in the Bhágavata.

* *Mlechchha.*

† Pártha, in the Sanskrit.

‡ Still another name of Arjuna. *Vide supra*, p. 156, note *.

§ दानमश्रोत्रिये यथा ।

‖ अहोऽतिबलवद्दैवं विना तेन महात्मना ।
यदसामर्थ्ययुक्तेऽपि नीचवर्गे जयप्रदम् ॥

¶ स्थानं तत् । His position as an archer, says Ratnagarbha: धानुष्कसंस्थानविशेषः ।

** To render *Arjunatwa.*

†† भीमस्य भीमत्वम् ।

‡‡ *Ábhira.*

cause." So saying, Arjuna* went to the city of Mathurá,† and there installed the Yádava prince, Vajra, as its king. There he‡ beheld Vyása, who was living in a wood; and he approached the sage,§ and saluted him respectfully. The Muni surveyed him for some time, as he lay prostrate at his feet, and said to him:|| "How is it that I see you thus shorn of your lustre?¶ Have you been guilty of illicit intercourse with women?** Or of the death of a Brahman? Or have you suffered some grievous disappointment, that you are so dejected?†† Have your prayers for progeny, or other good gifts, proved fruitless? Or have you indulged improper passions, that your lustre is so dim?‡‡ Or are you one that devours the meal he has given to the Brahmans? Say, Arjuna, have you seized upon the substance of the poor? Has the wind of a winnowing-basket lighted upon you? Or has an evil eye gazed upon you, Arjuna, that you look thus miserable?§§

---

* Jishńu, in the original. This is one of the many names or epithetical designations of Arjuna.

† Śrídhara and Ratnagarbha notice a variant expressing that Arjuna went from Indraprastha to Hastinápura. My Ajmere and Arrah MSS. simply substitute Indraprastha for Mathurá.

‡ The Sanskrit has Phálguna.

§ *Mahábhága.*

|| Pártha is the word here used.

¶ विच्छायः कथमत्यन्तमीदृशः ।

** This sentence is to render अवीरजोऽनुगमनम् । Both Śrídhara and Ratnagarbha dwell at length on the first of these words and its variant अवीरजा ।

†† भ्रष्टच्छायः ।

‡‡ सान्तानिकादयो वा ते याचमाना निराकृताः ।
अगम्यस्त्रीरतिर्वा त्वं तेनासि विगतप्रभः ॥

§§ विच्छायः ।

Have you been touched by the water of a finger-nail? Or has the water of a water-jar sprinkled you? Or, what is, most probably, the case, have you been beaten by your inferiors in battle?"*

Arjuna,† having sighed deeply, related to Vyása all the circumstances of his discomfiture, and continued: "Hari, who was our strength, our might, our heroism, our prowess, our prosperity, our brightness, has left us, and departed. Deprived of him, our friend, illustrious, and ever kindly speaking, we have become as feeble as if made of straw.‡ Purushottama, who was the living§ vigour of my weapons, my arrows, and my bow,|| is gone. As long as we looked upon him, fortune, fame, wealth, dignity¶ never abandoned us. But Govinda is gone from amongst us. That Kŕishńa has quitted earth, through whose power Bhíshma, Drońa, the king of Anga,** Duryodhana, and the rest were consumed. Not I alone, but Earth, has grown old, miserable,†† and lustreless, in the absence of the holder of the discus.‡‡ Kŕishńa, through devotion to whom Bhíshma and other mighty men perished like

---

* The Translator has here somewhat departed from the order of the original.

† Pártha, in the original.

‡ इतरेणेव महता स्मितपूर्वाभिभाषिणा ।
हीना वयं मुने तेन जातास्तृणमया इव ॥

Ratnagarbha begins this stanza with गौरवेण, *i. e.*, आदरेण, he says.

§ *Múrtta.*

|| Substituted, by the Translator, for Gáńdíva.

¶ *Unnati.*

** *Anga-rája.* Karńa is intended.

†† भ्रष्टच्छाया ।

‡‡ Chakrin.

moths in the flame of my valour, is gone; and I am, now, overcome by cowherds.* The bow Gáńdíva, that was famed throughout the three worlds, has been foiled, since he has departed, by the sticks of peasants.† The myriads of women over whom I was lord have been carried off from me by thieves, armed but with cudgels. The whole household‡ of Kŕishńa, O Kŕishńa,[1] has been (forcibly) carried away by peasants, who, with their staves, have put my strength to shame. That I am shorn of my lustre I do not marvel: it is wonderful that I live. Surely, grand-sire, I alone am so shameless as to survive the stain of indignity inflicted by the vile."§

Vyása replied to Arjuna, and said: "Think no more, my son,|| of your disgrace. It does not become you to grieve. Know that time subjects all beings to similar vicissitude.¶ Time effects the production and dissolution of all creatures. All that exists is founded on time. Know this, Arjuna, and retain your fortitude. Rivers, seas, mountains, the whole earth, gods, men, animals, trees, insects** are, all, created, and, all, will be de-

---

[1] A name of Vyása.††

---

* यस्यानुभावाद्भीष्माद्यैर्मय्यग्नौ शलभायितम् ।
विना तेनाद्य कृष्णेन गोपालैरस्मि निर्जितः ॥

† *Ábhíra.*

‡ *Avarodhana.* Ratnagarbha explains it to mean अन्तःपुरं स्त्रीवर्गः ।

§ निःश्रीकता न मे चित्रं यज्जीवामि तदद्भुतम् ।
नीचापमान एकाकी निर्लज्जोऽस्मि पितामह ॥

|| The original has Pártha.

¶ अवेहि सर्वभूतेषु कालस्य गतिमीदृशीम् ।

** *Sarisŕipa*; 'reptiles.' *Vide supra*, p. 59, note ††.

†† So the scholiasts allege.

stroyed, by time. Knowing that all that is is the effect of time, be tranquillized.* These mighty works† of Kŕishńa, whatever they have been, have been performed to relieve earth of its burthens: for this he has come down. Earth, oppressed by her load, has had recourse to the assembly‡ of the immortals; and Janárdana, who is one with time, has descended on that account. This object has been, now, accomplished. All the kings (of the earth) are slain; the race of Vŕishńi and Andhaka is destroyed: no more remained for him to accomplish.§ Therefore has the lord departed whither he pleased, his ends being, all, fulfilled.|| At the period of creation, the god of gods creates; in that of duration, he preserves; and, at the end (of all), he is mighty to annihilate.¶ Now all is done. Therefore, Arjuna,** be not afflicted by thy defeat. The prowess of mortals is the gift of time.†† Bhíshma, Drońa,‡‡ Karńa, and other kings have been slain by thee alone. This was the work of time: and why, therefore, should not thy discomfiture, by those less than thou art,

* कालात्मकमिदं सर्वं ज्ञात्वा शममवाप्नुहि।

कालात्मकम्। कालाधीनम्। Ratnagarbha.

† "Mighty works" is to render *máhátmya.*

‡ *Samiti.*

§ Add "on earth": भूमितले।

|| *Kŕitokŕitya*, 'satisfied,' 'happy.'

¶ अन्ताय समर्थः।

** Pártha, in the original.

†† भवन्ति भवकालेषु पुरुषाणां पराक्रमाः।

‡‡ I have inserted this name, to conform the translation to Śrídhara's text, which Professor Wilson, no doubt, hereabouts follows. Ratnagarbha's reading yields Bhíshma and Drońa, omitting Karńa; and therewith my Arrah MS. harmonizes.

occur?* In like manner as, through thy devotion to† Vishńu, these were overthrown by thee, so, at last, has thy defeat by miserable thieves been wrought by time.‡ That divinity, assuming various bodies, preserves the world; and, in the end, the lord of creatures destroys it. In the birth of thy fortunes,§ Janárdana was thy friend; in their decline,|| thy enemies have been favoured by Keśava. Who would have believed that thou shouldst slay all the descendants of Kuru, and kindred of Gangá?¶ Who would have believed that peasants** should triumph over thee? Be assured, son of Ṕithá,†† that it is (but) the sport of the universal‡‡ Hari, that the Kauravas have been destroyed by thee, and that thou hast been defeated by herdsmen.§§ With respect to the women whom thou lamentest, and who have been carried off by the thieves, hear from me an ancient story, which will explain why this has happened.||||

"In former times, a Brahman, named Ashtávakra,[1]

---

[1] The story of Ashtávakra is related in the Mahábhárata.¶¶ He was the son of Kahoda,*** who, neglecting his wife, was rebuked

---

* तेषामर्जुन कालोत्थः किं न्यूनाभिभवो न सः ।

† Read "through the might of": अनुभावेन ।

‡ ततस्तथैव भवतो दस्युभ्योऽन्ते तदुद्भवः ।

§ भवोद्भवे । || भवान्ते ।

¶ To render Gángeya. ** *Ábhíra.*

†† Pártha is the original word.

‡‡ *Sarva-bhúta. Vide supra,* p. 34, text and note ††.

§§ *Ábhíra.*

|||| तदप्यहं यथावृत्तं कथयामि तवार्जुन ।

¶¶ *Ádi-parvan, śl.* 10599, *et seq.*

*** Corrected from "Kahora".

was pursuing his religious penances, standing in water, and meditating on the eternal spirit, for many years.* In consequence of the overthrow of the Asuras, there was a great festival on the summit of Meru; on their way to which, Rambhá, Tilottamá,† and hundreds and thousands of beautiful nymphs‡ saw the ascetic Ashtávakra; and they praised and hymned him (for his devotions). They bowed down (before him), and eulogized him, (as he was immersed) up to his throat in water, his hair twisted in a braid. So they sang, in honour of him, whatever they thought would be most agreeable to that most eminent of Brahmans. Ashtávakra (at last,) said to them: 'I am well pleased with you, illustrious damsels.§ Whatever you wish for, ask of me, and I will give it you, however difficult it may be of attainment.' Then all those nymphs,|| Rambhá, Tilottamá, and others, recorded in the Vedas,¶ replied: 'It is enough for us that thou art pleased. What need we aught else, venerable Brahman?'** But some

---

for it by his yet unborn son. The father angrily cursed him, that he should be born bent in every part; and he was, accordingly, brought forth crooked (vakra) in eight limbs (ashtan).†† He became, nevertheless, a celebrated sage. See, also, Hindu Theatre, Vol. I., p. 293, note.

---

* अष्टावक्रः पुरा विप्रो जलवासरतोऽभवत् ।
बहून्वर्षगणान्पार्थ गृणन्ब्रह्म सनातनम् ॥

† See, for them, Vol. II., p. 75, note 3.

‡ वरस्त्रियः ।

§ "Illustrious damsels" is to translate महाभागाः ।

|| *Apsaras.*

¶ For Apsarases mentioned in the Vedas, see Vol. II., pp. 80, 81.

** प्रसन्ने त्वय्यपर्याप्तं किमस्माकमिति द्विज ।

†† With the name Ashtávakra compare Naikavakrá and Trivakrá, for which *vide supra*, p. 21, note †.

(amongst them) said: 'If, exalted sir, you are (indeed) pleased with us, then grant us a husband, the best of men,* and sovereign of the Brahmans.'† 'So be it,' replied Ashťávakra, and, thereupon, came up from the waters. When the nymphs beheld him coming out of the water, and saw that he was (very) ugly, and crooked in eight places, they could not restrain their merriment, but laughed aloud. The Muni was (very) angry, and cursed them, and said: 'Since you have been so impertinent as to laugh at my deformity, I denounce upon you this imprecation: through the grace I have shown unto you, you shall obtain the first of males‡ for your husband; but, in consequence of my curse, you shall (afterwards) fall into the hands of thieves.' When the nymphs heard this uttered by the Muni, they endeavoured to appease him; and (they so far succeeded, that) he announced to them, they should finally return to the sphere of the gods. It is in consequence, then, of the curse of the Muni Ashťávakra, that these females, who were, at first, the wives of Keśava, have, now, fallen into the hands of the barbarians;§ and there is no occasion, Arjuna,|| for you to regret it in the least. All this destruction has been effected by the lord of all; and your end is, also, nigh at hand, since he has withdrawn from you strength, splendour, valour, and preeminence.¶ Death is the doom of every

* Purushottama, *i, e.*, Vishńu or Kŕishńa.

† According to all my MSS., the term here rendered "sovereign of the Brahmans" is in the vocative, and applies to Ashťávakra.

‡ Purushottama, as above.

§ *Dasyu.*

|| Addressed, in the original, as Páńđava.

¶ *Máhátmya.*

one who is born; fall is the end of exaltation; union terminates in separation; and growth tends but to decay.* Knowing (all this), wise men are susceptible of neither grief nor joy; and those who learn their ways are even as they are,—(equally free from pleasure or pain). Do you, therefore, most excellent prince, understand this (truth), and, along with your brothers, relinquish everything, and repair to the holy forest. Go, now, and say, from me, to Yudhishṫhira,† that he, to-morrow, with his brethren, tread the path of heroes."‡

Thus instructed by Vyása, Arjuna went and related to the other sons of Pṛithá all that he had seen, had experienced, and had heard.§ When he had communicated to them the message of Vyása, the sons of Páńḍu placed Parikshit on the throne, and went to the forest.

I have thus narrated to you, Maitreya, in detail, the actions of Vásudeva, when he was born in the race of Yadu.

---

* जातस्य नियतं मृत्युः पतनं च तथोन्नतेः ।
विप्रयोगावसानस्य संयोगः संचयत्क्षयः ॥

Instead of संचयत्क्षयः, some MSS. give: संचयात्क्षयः ।

† Denominated, in the Sanskrit, by his epithet Dharmarája. Yama, also, is so called. See Vol. III., p. 118.

‡ परश्वो भ्रातृभिः सार्धं गतिं वीरपथा कुरु ।

The more ordinary reading ends the verse with the words यथा यासि तथा कुरु ।

§ इत्युक्तोऽभ्येत्य पार्थाभ्यां यमाभ्यां चाह सोऽर्जुनः ।
दृष्टं चैवानुभूतं च कथितं तदशेषतः ॥

By the two Párthas here spoken of, Yudhishṫhira and Bhíma are intended, in the opinion of Ratnagarbha.

The words च सहार्जुनः end the first verse, according to some MSS.

VISHŃU PURÁŃA.

BOOK VI.

CHAPTER I.

Of the dissolution of the world: the four ages: the decline of all things, and deterioration of mankind, in the Kali age.

MAITREYA.—You have narrated to me, illustrious sage, the creation (of the world), the genealogies (of the patriarchs), the duration* of the Manwantaras, and the dynasties† (of princes), in detail. I am now desirous to hear from you (an account of) the dissolution of the world, the season of total destruction, and that which occurs at the expiration of a Kalpa.[1]

PARÁŚARA.—Hear from me, Maitreya, exactly (the circumstances of) the end of all things,‡ and the disso-

---

[1] Two kinds of great or universal dissolution are here intimated; one occurring at the end of a Kalpa, or day of Brahmá, to which the term Upasaṁhṙiti is applied in the text, and Átyantika-laya by the commentator; § and the other taking place at the end of the life of Brahmá, which is termed a great or elemental dissolution: Mahá-pralaya and Prákṙita-pralaya.

---

* *Sthiti.*

† *Vaṁśanucharita.*

‡ *Upasaṁhṙiti.*

§ Ratnagarbha.

lution that occurs either at the expiration of a Kalpa, or that which takes place at the close of the life of Brahmá.* A month (of mortals) is a day and night of the progenitors: a year (of mortals is a day and night) of the gods. Twice a thousand aggregates of the four ages is a day and night of Brahmá.[1]† The four ages are the Kŕita, Tretá, Dwápara, and Kali; comprehending, together, twelve thousand years of the gods. There are infinite‡ successions of these four ages, of a similar description, the first of which is (always) called the Kŕita, and the last, the Kali. In the first, the Kŕita, is that age§ which is created by Brahmá; in the last, which is the Kali age, a dissolution of the world occurs.‖

MAITREYA.—Venerable sir, you are able to give me a description of (the nature of) the Kali age, in which four-footed virtue[2] suffers total extinction.

---

[1] These measures of time are more fully detailed in the First Book. See Vol. I., pp. 46, *et seq.*

[2] This is an allusion to a popular notion, originating, probably, with Manu: "In the Kŕita age, *the Genius of* truth and right * * * * stands firm on his four feet; * * * * but, in the

---

* "At the close of the life of Brahmá" is to translate प्राक्षते।

† चतुर्युगसहस्रे तु ब्रह्मणो द्वे द्विजोत्तम।

‡ *Aśesha.*

§ Read "creation". Professor Wilson here went wrong from following his favourite MS., which, from the fault of the copyist, begins the verse with आद्ये कृतयुगौ ब्रह्मणा। See the next note. Besides, *yuga*, in the sense of 'age', is neuter.

‖ आद्ये कृतयुगे सर्गो ब्रह्मणा क्रियते यतः।
क्रियते चोपसंहारस्तथान्त्ये च कलौ युगे॥

PARÁŚARA.—Hear, Maitreya, an account (of the nature) of the Kali age, respecting which you have inquired, and which is now close at hand.

The observance of caste, order, and institutes will not prevail in the Kali age;* nor will that of the ceremonial enjoined by the Sáma-, Rig-, and Yajur-Vedas. Marriages, in this age, will not be conformable to the ritual;† nor will the rules that connect the spiritual preceptor and his disciple be in force. The laws that regulate the conduct of husband and wife will be disregarded; and oblations to the gods with fire no longer be offered. In whatever family he may be born, a powerful and rich man will be held entitled to espouse maidens of every tribe. A regenerate man will be initiated in any way whatever; and such acts of penance as may be performed will be unattended by any results.[1]‡ Every text will be scripture, that people

following ages, * * * * he is deprived, successively, of one foot," &c. § I., 81, 82.||

[1] "Such an act is just what it is:" या सैव प्रायश्चित्तक्रिया कलौ ।¶ That is, it may be attended by iuconvenience to the individual, but is utterly inefficacious for the expiation of sin.

* वर्णाश्रमाचारवती प्रवृत्तिर्न कलौ नृणाम् ।

† *Dharmya.*

‡ यैव सैव च मैत्रेय प्रायश्चित्तक्रिया कलौ ।

§ From Sir William Jones's Translation.

|| चतुष्पात्सकलो धर्मः सत्यं चैव कृते युगे ।
नाधर्मेणागमः कश्चिन्मनुष्यान्प्रतिवर्तते ॥
इतरेष्वागमाद्धर्मः पादशस्त्ववरोपितः ।
चौरिकानृतमायाभिर्धर्मश्चापैति पादशः ॥

¶ This was suggested by the comment of Śrídhara, who understands penance to be spoken of which is performed simply for popular applause,

choose to think so;[1] all gods will be gods to them that worship them;* and all orders of life will be common alike to all persons. In the Kali age, fasting, austerity,† liberality, practised according to the pleasure of those by whom they are observed, will constitute righteousness. Pride (of wealth) will be inspired by very insignificant possessions. Pride of beauty‡ will be prompted by (no other personal charm than fine) hair. Gold, jewels, diamonds,§ clothes, will, all, have perished; and then hair will be the only ornament with which women can decorate themselves.|| Wives will desert their husbands, when they lose their property; and they only who are wealthy will be considered, by women, as their lords. He who gives away much (money) will be the master of men; and family descent

---

[1] Whether it is conformable or contradictory to the Vedas and the law. The passage ¶ may be rendered, also: "The doctrine or dogma of any one soever will be scripture."

---

and not to wipe away sin. His words are यैव सैवेति। प्रायश्चित्तक्रिया लोकरञ्जनमात्रार्था न तु पापक्षयार्था। Ratnagarbha says: यैव सैव। अनियतेत्यर्थः।

* देवताश्च कलौ सर्वाः। This rather implies, that unaccredited gods will receive honour. Ratnagarbha says: येन तेन कल्पिताः सर्वा देवताः।

† *Áyása.* Ratnagarbha explains it by penance, or pilgrimage: आयासः। कृच्छ्रादिः। तीर्थयात्रादिर्वा।

‡ In women. The verse runs:

स्त्रीणां रूपमदश्चैव केशैरेव भविष्यति।

§ *Ratna.*

|| कलौ स्त्रियो भविष्यन्ति तदा केशैरलंकृताः।

¶ सर्वमेव कलौ शास्त्रं यस्य यद्वचनं द्विज।

will no longer be a title of supremacy.* Accumulated treasures will be expended on (ostentatious) dwellings. The minds of men will be wholly occupied in acquiring wealth; and wealth will be spent solely on selfish gratifications.† Women will follow their inclinations, and be ever fond of pleasure. Men will fix their desires upon riches, even though dishonestly acquired. No man will part with the smallest fraction of the smallest coin,[1] though entreated by a friend. Men of all degrees will conceit themselves to be equal with Brahmans. Cows will be held in esteem, only as they supply milk.[2] The people will be, almost always, in dread of dearth, and apprehensive of scarcity,‡ and will, hence, ever be watching (the appearances of) the sky: they will, all, live, like anchorets,§ upon leaves, and roots, and fruit; and put a period to their lives, through fear of famine and want.|| In truth, there will never be abun-

---

[1] He will not part with the half of the half of half a Paṅa,—that is, with ten Cowries: a Paṅa being equal to eighty Cowries (or small shells).¶ Five Paṅas are equal to one Anna, or the sixteenth of a Rupee; and, at two shillings the Rupee, ten Cowries are equal to about one-seventh of a farthing.

[2] They will be valued for their individual use only, not from any notion of their generic sanctity.

---

* स्वामित्वहेतुः संबन्धो भावी नाभिजनस्तदा ।

† गृहान्ता द्रव्यसंघाता द्रव्यान्ता च तथा मतिः ।
अर्थास्त्वात्मोपभोगान्ता भविष्यन्ति कलौ युगे ॥

Much that follows this is, likewise, freely rendered.

‡ *Ksudh*, 'hunger,' 'famine.'

§ *Tápasa*, 'ascetics.'

|| अवृष्ट्यादिदुःखिताः ।

¶ See Colebrooke's *Algebra*, &c., p. 1.

dance, in the Kali age; and men will never enjoy pleasure and happiness.* They will take their food without previous ablution, and without worshipping fire, gods, or guests, or offering† obsequial libations to their progenitors. The women will be fickle,‡ short of stature, gluttonous. They will have many children, and little means. Scratching their heads with both hands, they will pay no attention to the commands of their husbands or parents. They will be selfish, abject, and slatternly; they will be scolds and liars; they will be indecent and immoral in their conduct, and will ever attach themselves to dissolute men. Youths, although disregarding the rules of studentship, will study the Vedas. Householders will neither sacrifice nor practise becoming liberality. Anchorets§ will subsist upon food accepted from rustics; and mendicants will be influenced by regard for friends and associates.[1] Princes, instead of protecting, will plunder, their subjects, and, under the pretext of levying customs, will

[1] The Bhágavata|| has: "Religious students will be regardless of vows and purification; householders will beg, not give alms; anchorets will dwell in villages; and mendicants will be desirous of riches."

* दुर्भिक्षमेव सततं तदा क्लेशमनीश्वराः ।
प्राप्स्यन्ति व्याहतसुखप्रमोदा मानवाः कलौ ॥

† Read "and they will not offer", &c.

‡ *Lolupa*, 'covetous.'

§ *Vanavása*, 'hermits.' *Vánaprasthas* are meant; for whose duties, see Vol. III., pp. 94—97.

|| XII., III., 33:

अव्रता बटवोऽशौचा भिक्षवश्च कुटुम्बिनः ।
तपस्विनो ग्रामवासा न्यासिनो ह्यर्थलोलुपाः ॥

rob merchants of their property. In the Kali age, every one who has cars, and elephants, and steeds will be a Raja;[1] every one who is feeble will be a slave.* Vaiśyas will abandon agriculture and commerce, and gain a livelihood by servitude,† or the exercise of mechanical arts.‡ Śúdras, seeking a subsistence by begging, and assuming the outward marks of religious mendicants, will become the impure followers of impious and heretical doctrines.[2]§

Oppressed by famine and taxation, men will desert their native lands, and go to those countries which are fit for coarser grains.[3] The path of the Vedas being

---

[1] That is, princes and warriors will be so no longer by virtue of their birth and caste.

[2] Most of the mendicant orders admit members without distinction of caste; but, probably, Buddhists, especially, are here intended. The Bhágavata repeatedly alludes to the diffusion of heretical doctrines and practices, the substitution of outward signs and marks for devotion, and the abandonment of the worship of Vishńu. The Śaiva mendicant orders are, probably, those especially in view. The same, probably, are intended, by our text, in the subsequent allusion to unauthorized austerities and sectarial marks.

[3] "Gavedhuka || (Coix barbata) and other bad sorts of grain:" गवेधुककदन्नाढ्यान्देशान् । Another reading is गोधूमान्नयवान्नाढ्यान्देशान् ।¶ "Countries growing wheat, barley, and the like." But to place wheat and barley amongst inferior grains, and to

---

* *Bhŕitya*, 'servant.'

† *Śúdra-vŕitti.*

‡ *Káru-karman.*

§ भैक्ष्यव्रतास्तथा शूद्राः प्रव्रज्यालिङ्गिनोऽधमाः ।
पाषण्डसंश्रयां वृत्तिमाश्रयिष्यन्त्यसंस्कृताः ॥

|| For *gavedhuká*, the same grain, see Vol. I., p. 95.

¶ This is Ratnagarbha's reading.

obliterated, and men having deviated into heresy, iniquity will flourish, and the duration of life will (therefore,) decrease. In consequence of horrible penances, not enjoined by scripture, and of the vices of the rulers, children will die in their infancy. Women will bear children at the sage of five, six, or seven years; and men beget them, when they are eight, nine, or ten. A man will be grey, when he is twelve; and no one will exceed twenty years of life.[1] Men will possess little sense, vigour, or virtue, and will, therefore, perish in a very brief period. In proportion as heresy extends, so, Maitreya, shall the progress of the Kali age be estimated by the wise. In proportion as the number of the pious who adhere to the lessons of the Vedas diminishes, as the efforts of individuals who cultivate virtue relax, as the first of males becomes no longer the object of sacrifices,* as respect for the teachers of the Vedas declines, and as regard is acknowledged for the disseminators of heresy, so may wise men note the augmented influence of the Kali age.[2]†

---

rank them lower than rice, is a classification that could have occurred to a native of Bengal alone.

[1] The Váyu says three and twenty; the Bhágavata,‡ from twenty to thirty.

[2] The complaints of the prevalence of heterodox doctrines, and neglect of the practices of the Vedas, which recur in the

---

* यदा यदा न यज्ञानामीश्वरः पुरुषोत्तमः ।
इज्यते पुरुषैर्यज्ञैस्तदा ज्ञेयं कलेर्बलम् ॥

† न प्रीतिर्वेदवादेषु पाषण्डेषु यदा रुचिः ।
कलिवृद्धिस्तदा प्राज्ञैरनुमेया द्विजोत्तम ॥

‡ XII., II., 11.

In the Kali age, Maitreya, men, corrupted by unbelievers, will refrain from adoring Vishńu, the lord of sacrifice,* the creator and lord of all, and will say: "Of what authority are the Vedas? What are gods, or Brahmans? What need is there of purification with water?"† Then will the clouds yield scanty rain; then will the corn be light in ear; and the grain will be (poor and) of little sap. Garments will be, mostly, made of the fibres of the San;[1]‡ the principal of trees will be the Śamí;[2] the prevailing caste will be the Śúdra. Millet will be the more common grain; the milk in use will be, chiefly, that of goats; unguents will be made of Uśíra-grass.§ The mother- and father-in-law will be venerated in place of parents; and a man's friends will be his brother-in-law, or one who has a

---

Bhágavata and our text, indicate a period of change in the condition of the Hindu religion, which it would be important to verify. If reference is made to Buddhism,—to which, in some respects, the allusions especially apply,—it would, probably, denote a period not long subseqnent to the Christian era; but it is more likely to be of a later date, or in the eighth and ninth centuries, when Śankara|| is said to have reformed a variety of corrupt practices, and given rise to others. See Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 12.¶

[1] Crotalaria juncea.

[2] The silk cotton, Bombax heptaphyllum.**

---

* *Yajnapati.* Variant: *jagatpati.*

† किं वेदैः किं द्विजैर्देवैः किं शौचेनाम्बुजन्मना ।

‡ *Sáńi.* The word also means 'mere rags'.

§ Andropogon muricatum.

|| See Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.

¶ Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 14, 15.

** This is the *śálmali.* Read acacia suma.

wanton * wife. Men will say: "Who has a father? Who has a mother? Each one is born according to his deeds." † And, therefore, they will look upon a wife's or husband's parents as their own. ‡ Endowed with little sense, men, subject to all the infirmities of mind, speech, and body, will daily commit sins; and everything that is calculated to afflict beings, vicious, impure, and wretched, will be generated in the Kali age. Then shall some places follow a separate duty,[1] § devoid

---

[1] The expression Kwachil lokah (क्वचिल्लोकः), 'a certain place,' is explained, by the commentator, || 'Kíkaťa, &c.' (कीकटादौ); confirming the inference that Buddhism is especially aimed at in the previous passages; for Kíkaťa, ¶ or South Behar, is the scene of Śákya's earliest and most successful labours.

---

* *Hári*, 'handsome.'

† यदा कर्मात्मकः पुमान् ।

‡ श्वशुरानुगता नराः । This is the whole that the English is intended to translate.

§ तदा प्रविरलो विप्र क्वचिल्लोको निवत्स्यति ।

|| So it is explained by both Śrídhara and Ratnagarbha.

¶ The Kíkaťas are spoken of in the *Ŕigveda*, III., LIII., 14. In the third volume of his Translation, Introduction, p. XX., Professor Wilson speculates on their locality; and, again, in p. 86, note 4, commenting on the passage adverted to, as follows: "The Kíkaťas are said, by Sáyańa,—following Yáska, *Nirukta*, VI., 32,—to be countries inhabited by *anáryas*, people who do not perform worship, who are infidels, *nástikas*. Kíkaťa is usually identified with South Behar; showing, apparently, that Vaidik Hinduism had not reached the province, when this was said. Or, as Kíkaťa was the fountain-head of Buddhism, it might be asserted that the Buddhists were here alluded to, if it were not wholly incompatible with all received notions of the earlier date of the Vedas."

Père Vivien de Saint-Martin, in his *Étude sur la Géographie*, &c., pp. 138—144, is very full, if not conclusive, on the country of the Kíkaťas. It is by no means improbable that this name was borne by two peoples, sundered by a very considerable interval of space, and belonging to different periods. In the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, I., III., 24, it is said that Buddha, son of Anjana, will be born among the Kíkaťas.

of holy study, oblations to fire,* and invocations of the gods.[1]† Then, in the Kali age, shall a man acquire, by a trifling exertion, as much eminence in virtue as is the result of arduous penance in the Kŕita age (or age of purity).[2]

---

[1] Several of the Puráńas contain allusions to the degeneracy of the Kali age; but none afford more copious details. The description in the Bhágavata is much shorter; that of the Váyu is much the same, and employs many of the same verses and illustrations.

[2] This might be suspected of being said ironically, referring to what had been just observed of places where a religion prevailed that required neither study nor sacrifice. The commentator, however, understands it literally, and asserts, that allusion is here made to the Vaishńava faith, in which devotion to Vishńu or Kŕishńa, and the mere repetition of his name, are equally efficacious, in the Kali age, with the penances and sacrifices of the preceding ages. Therefore, he concludes, the Kali, by this one property, is the best of all the ages: अनेनैकेन गुणेन कलिः सर्वश्रेष्ठ इत्यर्थः ।‡ This interpretation is confirmed by the following Chapter.

---

* *Vashatkára.* See Vol. II., p. 29, notes 3 and §.

† *Swadhá* and *swáhá.* See Vol. III., p. 122, note ‡, *ad finem.*

‡ Both the commentators give this explanation

CHAPTER II.

Redeeming properties of the Kali age. Devotion to Vishńu sufficient to salvation, in that age, for all castes and persons.

UPON this subject, Maitreya, you shall hear what the wise Vyása has related, as it is communicated truly by me.

It was, once, a matter of dispute, amongst the sages, at what season the least moral merit obtained the greatest reward, and by whom it was most easily displayed. In order to terminate the discussion, they went to Veda Vyása, to remove their doubts.* They found the illustrious Muni, my son, half immersed in the water of the Ganges;† and, awaiting the close of his ablutions, the sages remained on the banks of the sacred‡ stream, under shelter of a grove of trees. As my son plunged down into the water, and again rose up from it, the Munis heard him exclaim: "Excellent, excellent is the Kali age!" Again he dived, and, again rising, said, in their hearing: "Well done, well done, Śúdra! Thou art happy." Again he sank down; and, as he once more emerged, they heard him say: "Well done, well done, women! They are happy. Who are more fortunate than they?" After this, my son finished his bathing; and the sages met him, as he approached to welcome them. After he had given them seats, and

* संदेहनिर्णयार्थाय वेदव्यासं महामुनिम् ।
ययुस्ते संशयं प्रष्टुं मैत्रेय मुनिपुङ्गवाः ॥

† Jáhnaví, in the original.

‡ 'Great', according to the Sanskrit.

they had proffered their respects, the son of Satyavatí* said to them: "On what account have you come to me?" They replied: "We came to you to consult you on a subject on which we entertain some doubt. But that may be, at present, suspended. Explain to us something else. We heard you say: 'Excellent is the Kali age. Well done, Śúdra! Well done, women!' Now we are desirous to know why this was said, why you called them, repeatedly, happy. Tell us the meaning of it, if it be not a mystery. We will then propose to you the question that occupies our thoughts."

Being thus addressed by the Munis, Vyása smiled, and said to them: "Hear, excellent sages, why I uttered the words 'Well done! Well done!' The fruit of penance, of continence,† of silent prayer, and the like, practised, in the Kṛita age, for ten years, in the Tretá, for one year, in the Dwápara, for a month, is obtained, in the Kali age, in a day and night. Therefore did I exclaim: 'Excellent, excellent is the Kali age.' That reward which a man obtains, in the Kṛita, by abstract meditation, in the Tretá, by sacrifice, in the Dwápara, by adoration, he receives, in the Kali, by merely reciting the name of Keśava. In the Kali age, a man displays the most exalted virtue by (very) little exertion: therefore, (pious sages,) who know what virtue is, I was pleased with the Kali age. Formerly, the Vedas were to be acquired, by the twice-born, through the diligent observance of self-denial;‡ and it was their duty to celebrate sacrifices conformably to the ritual.

* See Vol. IV., p. 158.

† *Brahmacharya.*

‡ *Vratacharyá.*

Then idle prayers,* idle feasts, and fruitless ceremonies were practised but to mislead the twice-born; for, although observed, by them, devoutly, yet, in consequence of some irregularity in their celebration, sin was incurred in all their works; and what they ate or what they drank did not effect the fulfilment of their desires.† In all their objects the twice-born enjoyed no independence; and they attained their respective spheres only with exceeding pain. The Śúdra, (on the contrary,) more fortunate than they, reaches his assigned station by rendering them service, and performing merely the sacrifice of preparing food,‡ in which § no rules determine what may or may not be eaten, what may or may not be drunk. Therefore, most excellent sages,|| is the Śúdra fortunate.

"Riches are accumulated, by men, in modes not incompatible with their peculiar duties; and they are then to be bestowed upon the worthy, and expended in constant sacrifice. There is great trouble in their acquisition; great care, in their preservation; great distress, from the want of them;¶ and great grief, for

---

* *Kathá.* "Praise of Krishńa", the commentators say.

† A free rendering.

‡ पाकयज्ञाधिकारवान् । This implies "possessing the privilege of domestic sacrifices." For the *pákayajnas*, which have nothing to do with ordinary cookery, see Vol. III., p. 114, notes ‡ and §.

§ This has not the connexion with what precedes that the Translator supposed. For "in which", read "and for him", or the like,—to render freely.

|| *Muni-śárdúla.*

¶ It is, rather, implied, that there is difficulty in the proper application of them:

तथा सद्विनियोगाय विज्ञेयं गहनं नृणाम् ।

their loss.* Thus, eminent Brahmans, through these and other sources of anxiety, men attain their allotted spheres of Prajápati† and the rest, (only by exceeding labour and suffering). (This is not the case with women.) A woman has only to honour her husband, in act, thought, and speech, to reach the same region to which he is elevated; and she, thus, accomplishes her object without any great exertion. This was the purport of my exclamation 'Well done!' the third time. I have, thus, related to you (what you asked). Now demand the question you came to put to me, in any way you please; and I will make you a distinct reply."

The Munis then said (to Vyása): "The question we intended to have asked you has been already answered, by you, in your reply to our subsequent inquiry." On hearing which, Kŕishńa Dwaipáyana laughed, and said to the holy persons‡ who had come to see him, whose eyes were wide open with astonishment: "I perceived, with the eye (of) divine (knowledge), the question you intended to ask; and, in allusion to it, I uttered the expressions 'Well done! Well done!' In truth, in the Kali age, duty is discharged with very little trouble§ by mortals whose faults are, all, washed away by the water of their individual merits; by Śúdras, through diligent attendance (only) upon the twice-born; and by women, through the slight effort of obedience to their husbands. Therefore, Brahmans, did I thrice ex-

---

* I find no Sanskrit for this clause.

† In the original, Prájápatya. For this heaven, see Vol. I., p. 98, notes 1 and *.

‡ *Tápasa.*

§ Some MSS. yield 'time'.

press my admiration of their happiness; for, in the Kŕita and other ages, great were the toils of the regenerate to perform their duty. I waited not for your inquiry, but replied, at once, to the question you purposed to ask. Now, ye who know what virtue is, what else do you wish me to tell you?"

The Munis then saluted and praised Vyása, and, being freed, by him, from uncertainty, departed as they came. To you, also, excellent (Maitreya), have I imparted this secret,—this one great virtue of the (otherwise) vicious Kali age.* The dissolution † of the world, and the aggregation of the elements,‡ I will now describe to you.[1]

---

[1] The illustration of the efficacy of devotion to Vishńu, given in this Chapter, is peculiar to this Puráńa; but the doctrine is common to it and the Bhágavata. It is repeatedly inculcated in that work. The parallel passage, in the Twelfth Book,§ is the following: "Purushottama, abiding in the hearts of men, takes

---

* Śrídhara seems to recognize the following verse, disregarded by the Translator:

कीर्त्तनादेव कृष्णस्य मुक्तबन्धः परं व्रजेत् ।

This verse is identical with one near the end of the passage cited, from the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, in note §, below.

† *Upasaḿhŕiti.*

‡ प्राकृतामन्तरालाम् । Śrídhara: अन्तरालाम् । ब्रह्मणो दिने दिने भवाम् । Ratnagarbha: अन्तरालाम् । दैनंदिनीम् ।

§ Chapter III., 45—52:

पुंसां कलिकृतान्दोषान्द्रव्यदेशात्मसंभवान् ।
सर्वान्हरति चित्तस्थो भगवान्पुरुषोत्तमः ॥
श्रुतः संकीर्त्तितो ध्यातः पूजितश्चादृतोऽपि वा ।
नृणां धुनोति भगवान्हृत्स्थो जन्मायुताशुभम् ॥
यथा हेम्नि स्थितो वह्निर्दुर्वर्णं हन्ति धातुजम् ।
एवमात्मगतो विष्णुर्योगिनामशुभाशयम् ॥

away all the sins of the Kali age, produced by place or property. Bhagavat, abiding in the heart, and heard, repeated, read of, worshipped, or honoured, dissipates the ills of men for ten thousand births. As fire, entering into the substance of gold, purifies it from the alloy with which it is debased in the mine, so Vishńu, united with the devotee, is the refiner from all that is evil. By learning, penance, suppression of breath, friendship, pilgrimage, ablution, mortification, gifts, prayer, the soul attains not that exceeding purity which it derives from the presence of Vishńu. Therefore, with all your soul, O king, hold Keśava ever present in your heart. Let one about to die be most careful in this; for so he goes to supreme felicity. Let the name of the supreme god, Vishńu, be repeated, diligently, by all, in their last moments; for he who desires liberation shall attain it by the frequent repetition of the name of Kŕishńa. Final felicity is derived, in the Kŕita age, from holy study; in the Tretá, from religious rites. In the Dwápara, it is attained by pious services; but, in the Kali age, it is secured by repeating the name of Hari." Similar doctrines are taught in the Gítá, and other Vaishńava works. See Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 116.*

विद्यातपःप्राणनिरोधमैत्री-
तीर्थाभिषेकव्रतदानजप्यैः ।
नात्यन्तशुद्धिं लभतेऽन्तरात्मा
यथा हृदिस्थे भगवत्यनन्ते ॥
तस्मात्सर्वात्मना राजन्हृदिस्थं कुरुकेशवम् ।
म्रियमाणो ह्यवहितस्ततो यासि परां गतिम् ॥
म्रियमाणैरभिध्येयो भगवान्परमेश्वरः ।
आत्मभावं न यत्यङ्गसर्वात्मा सर्वसंश्रयः ॥
कलेर्दोषनिधे राजन्नस्ति ह्येको महागुणः ।
कीर्त्तनादेव कृष्णस्य मुक्तबन्धः परं व्रजेत् ॥
कृते यद्ध्यायतो विष्णुं त्रेतायां यजतो मखैः ।
द्वापरे परिचर्यायां कलौ तद्धरिकीर्त्तनात् ॥

* Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., p. 161.

CHAPTER III.

Three different kinds of dissolution. Duration of a Parárdha. The clepsydra, or vessel for measuring time. The dissolution that occurs at the end of a day of Brahmá.

THE dissolution* of existing beings is of three kinds,—incidental, elemental, and absolute.[1] The incidental is that which relates to Brahmá, and occurs at the end of a Kalpa; the elemental is that which takes

---

[1] The first is called Naimittika,† 'occasional' or 'incidental,' or Bráhmya, as occasioned by the intervals of Brahmá's days; the destruction of creatures, though not of the substance of the world, occurring during his night. The general resolution of the elements into their primitive source, or Prakŕiti, is the Prákŕitika destruction, and occurs at the end of Brahmá's life. The third, the absolute or final, Átyantika, is individual annihilation; Moksha, exemption for ever from future existence.‡ The Bhágavata§ here notices the fourth kind, of which mention occurred in a preceding passage (Vol. I., p. 113),—Nitya, or constant dissolution;—explaining it to be the imperceptible change that all things suffer in the various stages of growth and decay, life and death. "The various conditions of beings subject to change are occasioned by that constant dissolution of life which is rapidly produced by the resistless stream of time, taking everything perpetually away:"

कालस्रोतोजवेनाशु ह्रियमाणस्य नित्यदा ।
परिणामिनामवस्थास्ता जन्मप्रलयहेतवः ॥

The Váyu describes but three kinds of Pralaya, omitting the Nitya.

---

* *Pratisanchara.* See Vol. I., p. 52, note *.

† Corrected from "Naimittaka".

‡ *Vide supra,* p. 61, note §, *ad finem.*

§ XII., IV., 35.

place after two Parárdhas; the absolute is (final) liberation * (from existence).

Maitreya.—Tell me, excellent master, what is the enumeration of a Parárdha, the expiration of two of which is the period of elemental dissolution.[1]

Paráśara.—A Parárdha, Maitreya, is that number which occurs in the eighteenth place of figures, enumerated according to the rule of decimal notation.[2] At

---

[1] Maitreya has a rather indifferent memory (see Vol. I., pp. 46, 47); but the periods specified in the two places do not agree. In the First Book, two Parárdhas, as equal to one hundred years of Brahmá, are 311.040.000.000.000 years of mortals.

[2] Counting according to this mode of enumeration, a Parárdha is represented by 100.000.000.000.000.000. The Váyu Puráńa † has

---

* *Moksha.*

† Quoted by Śrídhara and Ratnagarbha, as follows:

कोटिकोटिसहस्राणि परार्धमिति कीर्त्यते ।
परार्धं द्विगुणं चापि परमाहुर्मनीषिणः ॥
स्थानं दशगुणं विद्यादेकं दश शतं ततः ।
सहस्रमयुतं तस्मान्नियुतं प्रयुतं ततः ॥
अर्बुदं न्यर्बुदं चैव वृन्दं चैव ततः परम् ।
खर्वं चैव निखर्वं च शङ्कुः पद्मस्तथैव च ॥
समुद्रो मध्यमन्तश्च परार्धं परमेव च ।
एवमष्टादशैतानि पदानि गणनाविधौ ॥

The English of this is, in brief, as below, and corrects Professor Wilson's representation, in several particulars:

Eka	1
Daśa	10
Śata	100
Sahasra	1.000
Ayuta	10.000
Niyuta	100.000
Prayuta	1.000.000
Arbuda	10.000.000

the end of twice that period, elemental dissolution occurs, when all the discrete products of nature are

---

a term for each of these decimal values: Daśa (दश), 10; Śata (शत), 100; Sahasra (सहस्र), 1000; Ayuta (अयुत), 10.000; Niyuta (नियुत), 100.000; Prayuta (प्रयुत), 1.000.000; Arbuda (अर्बुद), 10.000.000; Nyarbuda* (न्यर्बुद), 100.000.000; Vŕinda (वृन्द), 1.000.000.000; Para† (पर), 10.000.000.000; Kharva (खर्व), 100.000.000.000; Nikharva (निखर्व), 1.000.000.000.000; Śankha (शङ्ख), 10.000.000.000.000; Padma (पद्म), 100.000.000.000.000; Samudra (समुद्र), 1.000.000.000.000.000; Madhyama ‡ (मध्यम), 10.000 000.000.000.000;§ Parárdha (परार्ध), 100.000.000.000.000.000. ||

Nyarbuda	100.000.000
Vŕinda	1.000.000.000
Kharva	10.000.000.000
Nikharva	100.000.000.000
Śankha	1.000 000.000.000
Padma	10.000.000.000.000
Samudra	100.000.000.000.000
Madhya	1.000.000.000.000.000
Anta	10.000.000.000.000.000
Parárdha	100.000.000.000.000.000

2 *parárdhas*, *i. e.*, half-*paras*, = a *para*.

Our commentators' manuscripts of the *Váyu-puráńa* must have differed very noticeably, as to the foregoing passage, from those to which I have access.

A *niyuta* denotes, according to different authorities, a hundred thousand, a million, &c. More usually, however, it is a synonym of *laksha*; as in the passage annotated *supra*, p. 92, note ‡. See Messrs. Böhtlingk and Roth's *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, *sub voce* नियुत.

For a very learned article on Sanskrit numeration, from the pen of Dr. Albrecht Weber, see the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. XV., pp. 132—140.

* Corrected from "Nyurvuda", and the Sanskrit similarly.

† The original word is not, here, a technicality.

‡ Read "Madhya". See note † in the preceding page.

§ *Anta* is here omitted.

|| In the *Lílávatí*, Chapter II., Section I., the *parárdha* is arrived at differently, in this wise:

withdrawn into their indiscrete source. The shortest period of time is a Mátrá, which is equal to the twinkling of the human eye.* Fifteen Mátrás make a Káshṫhá; thirty Káshṫhás, one Kalá; fifteen Kalás, one Nád̄iká. A Nád̄iká is ascertained by a measure of water, with a vessel made of twelve Palas and a half of copper, in the bottom of which there is to be a hole made with a tube of gold, of the weight of four Máshas, and four inches long.[1]† According to the Mágadha measure,

---

In the First Book, the Parárdha, as the half of Brahmá's life, is but 155.520.000.000.000,—fifteen, instead of eighteen, places of figures.

[1] The description of the Clepsydra is very brief, and wanting

---

Eka	1
Daśa	10
Śata	100
Sahasra	1.000
Ayuta	10.000
Laksha	100.000
Prayuta	1.000.000
Koṫi	10.000.000
Arbuda	100.000.000
Abja	1.000.000.000
Kharva	10.000.000.000
Nikharva	100.000.000.000
Mahápadma	1.000.000.000.000
Śanku	10.000.000.000.000
Jaladhi	100.000.000.000.000
Antya	1.000.000.000.000.000
Madhya	10.000.000.000.000.000
Parárdha	100.000.000.000.000.000

As words, *abja* is a synonym of *padma*; and *jaladhi*, of *samudra*.

* निमेषो मानुषो योऽयं मात्रामात्रः प्रमाणतः ।

† उन्मानेनाम्भसः सा तु पलान्यर्धत्रयोदश ।
हेममाषैः कृतच्छिद्रश्चतुर्भिश्चतुरङ्गुलैः ॥

The expression अर्धत्रयोदश is explained, by the commentators, to mean "twelve and a half". The *Bhágavata-puráṅa* has *dwádaśárdha*.

the vessel should hold a Prastha (or sixteen Palas) of water. Two of these Nádikás make one Muhúrtta,—thirty of which are one day and night. Thirty such periods form a month; twelve months make a year, or a day and night of the gods; and three hundred and sixty such days constitute a year of the celestials. An aggregate of four ages contains twelve thousand divine years; and a thousand periods of four ages complete a day of Brahmá. That period is, also, termed a Kalpa, during which fourteen Manus preside; and, at the end of it, occurs the incidental or Brahmá dissolution. The nature of this dissolution is very fearful. Hear me describe it, as well as that which takes place at the elemental dissolution, which I will, also, relate to you.

At the end of a thousand periods of four ages, the earth is, for the most part, exhausted. A total dearth then ensues, which lasts a hundred years; and, in conse-

---

in precision. One of the commentaries* is more explicit: "A vessel made of twelve Palas and a half of copper, and holding a Prastha, (Mágadha measure) of water, broad at top, and having, at bottom, a tube of gold, of four Máshas weight, four fingers long, is placed in water; and the time in which the vessel is filled by the hole in the bottom is called a Nádiká:" सार्धद्वादशपलताम्रमयं मागधं प्रस्थं संमितमूर्ध्वायतं पात्रं चतुर्माषचतुरङ्गुलहेमशलाकया कृताधश्छिद्रं जले स्थापितं तेन च्छिद्रेण यावता कालेन पूर्यते तावत्कालो नाडिकेति। The term Śaláká generally means a needle or stake; but it must, here, denote a pipe. The common measure of the Nádí is a thin shallow brass cup, with a small hole in the bottom. It is placed on the surface of water, in a large vessel, where nothing can disturb it, and where the water gradually fills the cup, and sinks it. Asiatic Researches, Vol. V., p. 87.

---

* Śrídhara's. Ratnagarbha enters into further particulars.

quence of the failure of food, all beings become languid and exanimate, and, at last, entirely perish.* The eternal† Vishńu then assumes the character of Rudra, the destroyer, and descends to reunite all (his) creatures with himself. He enters into the seven rays of the sun,[1]‡ drinks up all the waters (of the globe), and causes all moisture whatever, in living bodies or in the soil, to evaporate; thus drying up the whole earth. The seas, the rivers, the mountain torrents, and springs are, all, exhaled; and so are all the waters of Pátála,§ (the regions below the earth). Thus fed, through his intervention,|| with abundant moisture, the seven solar rays dilate to seven suns,[2] whose radiance glows above,

---

[1] See Vol. II., p. 297, note 1.

[2] These, also, have their several appellations. The commentator¶ quotes the Vedas,** as the authority: Áraga,†† Bhrája, Pat́ala, Patanga, Swarńabháj,‡‡ Jyotishmat, and Savibhása.§§

---

* ततो यान्यल्पसाराणि तानि सत्त्वान्यशेषतः ।
क्षयं यान्ति मुनिश्रेष्ठ पार्थिवान्यन्नपीडनात् ॥

† *Avyaya.* See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.

‡ See the *Taittiríya-áraṅyaka*, I., VII., I. The seven suns are there called Ároga, Bhrája, Pat́ara, Patanga, Swarńara, Jyotishímat, and Vibhása.

§ "The Pátálas", according to the Sanskrit. For these domains, see Vol. II., pp. 209, *et seq.*

|| *Anubháva.*

¶ Both the commentators give the names following.

** Hereon the commentators cite a stanza: Ratnagarbha gives it as anonymous; but Śrídhara refers it to the *Kúrma-puráńa.* The seven rays are there said to be Sushumńa, Harikeśa, Viśwakarman, Viśwavyarchas (?), Varchas, Vasu, Saḿpadvasu (?).

Compare the particulars in notes 1 and † to p. 297 of Vol. II.

†† So reads Ratnagarbha. Śrídhara hasÁroga.

‡‡ Corrected from "Swamábhák". Śrídhara's reading, in my one MS., seems to be Swarńaroman.

§§ Vibhávasu, according to Śrídhara.

below, and on every side,* and sets the three worlds and Pátála† on fire. The three worlds, consumed by these suns, become rugged and deformed,‡ throughout the whole extent of their mountains, rivers, and seas; and the earth, bare of verdure, and destitute of moisture, alone remains, resembling, in appearance, the back of a tortoise. The destroyer of all things, Hari, in the form of Rudra, who is the flame of time, § becomes the scorching breath of the serpent Śesha, and thereby reduces Pátála || to ashes. The great fire, when it has burnt all the divisions of Pátála, proceeds to the earth, and consumes it, also.¶ A vast whirlpool of eddying flame then spreads to the region of the atmosphere,** and the sphere of the gods,†† and wraps them in ruin. The three spheres show like a frying-pan, amidst the surrounding flames that prey upon all moveable or stationary things. The inhabitants of the two (upper) spheres, having discharged their functions,‡‡ and being annoyed by the heat, remove to (the sphere above, or) Mahar-loka. When that becomes heated, its tenants, who, after the full period of their stay, are desirous of

---

* There is no Sanskrit for "on every side".

† The plural is better.

‡ For "rugged and deformed" the original has *nissneha*, "deprived of moisture."

§ *Kálágni*. See Vol. I., p. 128, text and note ‡.

|| The original has the plural.

¶ पातालानि समस्तानि स दग्ध्वा ज्वलनो महान् ।
भूमिमभ्येत्य सकलं बभस्ति वसुधातलम् ॥

** *Bhuvar-loka*. Variant: *Bhuvo-loka*.

†† *Swar-loka*.

‡‡ *Kŕitádhikára*. Variant: *hŕitádhikára*, "deprived of office."

ascending to higher regions, depart for the Jana-loka.[1]*

Janárdana, in the person of Rudra, having consumed the whole world, breathes forth heavy clouds; and those called Saḿvartaka,† resembling vast elephants, in bulk, overspread the sky,—roaring, and darting lightnings. Some are as black as the blue lotos; some are (white) as the water-lily; some are dusky, like smoke; and some are yellow; some are (of a dun colour,) like (that of) an ass; some, like ashes sprinkled on the forehead;‡ some are (deep blue,) as the lapis lazuli; some

[1] The passage§ may, also, be understood: "Those go to Jana-loka, who are desirous of obtaining Brahma, or final liberation, through the ten stages of perfection,—devotion, penance, truth, &c." In the Váyu Puráńa, more details are specified. Those sainted mortals who have diligently worshipped Vishńu, and are distinguished for piety, abide, at the time of dissolution, in Mahar-loka, with the Pitŕis, the Manus, the seven Ŕishis, the various orders of celestial spirits, and the gods. These, when the heat of the flames that destroy the world reaches to Mahar-loka, repair to Jana-loka, in their subtile forms, destined to become reembodied, in similar capacities as their former, when the world is renewed, at the beginning of the succeeding Kalpa. This continues throughout the life of Brahmá. At the expiration of his life, all are destroyed; but those who have then attained a residence in the Brahma-loka, by having identified themselves, in spirit, with the Supreme, are, finally, resolved into the sole-existing Brahma.||

* तस्मादपि महातापतप्ता लोकास्ततः परम् ।
गच्छन्ति जनलोकं ते दशावृत्त्या परैषिणः ॥

† Corrected from "Samvartta". See Vol. I., p. 53, note 3.

‡ I find लाक्षारससनिभाः ।

§ Both the commentaries dwell on it at length.

|| For the various Lokas and their denizens, see Vol. II., pp. 225, *et seq.*

(azure), like the sapphire; some are (white) as the conch or the jasmine; and some are (black) as collyrium; some are (of bright red), like the lady-bird;* some are of the fierceness of red arsenic;† and some are like the wing of the (painted) jay. (Such are these massy clouds, in hue.) In form, some resemble towns; some, mountains: some are like houses and hovels;‡ and some are like columns. § Mighty in size, and loud in thunder, they fill all space.|| Showering down torrents of water, these clouds quench the dreadful fires which involve the three worlds; and then they rain, uninterruptedly, for a hundred years, and deluge the whole world. Pouring down, in drops as large as dice, these rains overspread the earth, and fill the middle region,¶ and inundate heaven. The world is now enveloped in darkness; and, all things, animate or inanimate, having perished, the clouds continue to pour down their waters for more than a hundred years.

---

* *Indragopa.* See Vol. IV., p. 284, note *.

† मनःशिलनिभास्तथा ।

‡ "Houses and hovels" is to render *kúṭágára*, which denotes a superstructure on the roof of a house.

§ Śrídhara reads *sthúla*, 'a heap', 'a tent'; Ratnagarbha, *úrńa*, 'wool'. Other lections which I find are *sthala* 'a mound', 'a tent'; and *stháńa*, of unascertained signification.

|| *Nabhas-tala.*

¶ *Bhuvo-loka.*

CHAPTER IV.

Continuation of the account of the first kind of dissolution. Of the second kind, or elemental dissolution; of all being resolved into primary spirit.

WHEN the waters have reached the region of the seven Ṛishis,* and the whole of the three worlds is one ocean, they stop. The breath of Vishṅu becomes a (strong) wind, which blows for more than a hundred years, until all the clouds are dispersed. The wind is then reabsorbed; and he of whom all things are made, the lord by whom all things exist,† he who is inconceivable, without beginning, beginning of the universe,‡ reposes, sleeping upon Śesha, in the midst of the deep. The creator,§ Hari, sleeps (upon the ocean), in the form of Brahmá,—glorified by Sanaka|| and the saints¶ who had gone to the Jana-loka, and contemplated by the holy inhabitants of Brahma-loka, anxious for final liberation,—involved in mystic slumber, the celestial personification of his own illusions, and meditating on his own ineffable spirit, which is called Vásudeva.**

---

* See Vol. II., p. 226, and p. 230, note †.

† भूतभावनः ।

‡ Corrected from the printer's error "without beginning of the universe." The original is अनादिरादिर्विश्वस्य ।

§ *Ádikṛit.*

|| See Vol. I., p. 59, and p. 77, note 1; also, Vol. II., p. 200, note ‡.

¶ *Siddha.*

** आत्ममायामयीं दिव्यां योगनिद्रां समास्थितः ।
आत्मानं वासुदेवाख्यं चिन्तयन्परमेश्वरः ॥

For Yoganidrá, which the Translator here renders by "mystic slumber", see Vol. IV., p. 260, note 1.

This, Maitreya, is the dissolution* termed incidental; because Hari, in the form of Brahmá, sleeps there, as its incidental cause.†

When the universal spirit wakes, the world revives; when he closes his eyes, all things fall upon the bed of mystic slumber.‡ In like manner as a thousand great ages constitute a day of Brahmá,§ so his night consists of the same period,—during which the world is submerged by a vast ocean. Awaking at the end of his night, the unborn, Vishńu, in the character of Brahmá, creates the universe anew, in the manner formerly related to you.[1]

I have, thus, described to you the intermediate dissolution‖ of the world, occurring at the end¶ of every Kalpa. I will now, Maitreya, describe to you elemental dissolution. When, by dearth and fire, all the worlds and Pátálas are withered up, and the modifications of Mahat and other products of nature are, by the will of Kŕishńa, destroyed, the progress of elemental dissolution is begun. Then, first, the waters swallow up the property of earth, (which is the rudiment of smell);

---

[1] The Naimittika Pralaya is described in the Váyu, Bhágavata, Kúrma, and other Puráńas, to the same effect, and, very commonly, in precisely the same words.

---

* *Pratisanchara.*

† "Incidental cause" is for *nimitta*. See Vol. I., p. 65, note †, *ad finem.*

‡ निमीलत्येतदखिलं योगशय्याशये ऽच्युते।

§ The original has Padmayoni, the same as Abjayoni, for which see Vol. I., p. 17, note †.

‖ *Pralaya.*

¶ *Saḿhára.*

and earth, deprived of its property, proceeds to destruction. Devoid of the rudiment of odour, the earth becomes one with water.* The waters, then, being much augmented, roaring, and rushing along, fill up all space, whether agitated or still.† When the universe is, thus, pervaded by the waves of the watery element, its rudimental flavour is licked up by the element of fire; and, in consequence of the destruction of their rudiments, the waters themselves are destroyed.‡ Deprived of (the essential rudiment of) flavour, they become one with fire; and the universe is, therefore, entirely filled with flame, § which drinks up the water on every side, and gradually overspreads the whole of the world. While space is enveloped in flame, above, below, and all around, the element of wind seizes upon the rudimental property, or form, which is the cause of light;|| and, that being withdrawn, ¶ all becomes of the nature of air. The rudiment of form being destroyed, and fire** deprived of its rudiment, air extinguishes fire, and spreads, resistlessly, over space, which is deprived of light, when fire merges into air. Air, then, accompanied by sound, which is the source of ether, extends

---

* Śrídhara, like several independent MSS., here interposes the following verse:

रसाज्जलं समुद्भूतं तस्माज्जातं रसात्मकम् ।

† तिष्ठन्ति विचरन्ति च ।

‡ अपामपि गुणो यस्तु ज्योतिषा पीयते तु सः ।
नश्यन्त्यापस्ततस्ताश्च रसतन्मात्रसंक्षयात् ॥

§ अग्न्यवस्थे तु सलिले तेजसा सर्वतो वृते ।

|| ज्योतिषोऽपि परं रूपं वायुरत्ति प्रभाकरम् ।

¶ *Pralína.*

** *Vibhávasu.*

everywhere throughout the ten regions of space,* until ether seizes upon contact,† its rudimental property, by the loss of which, air is destroyed, and ether‡ remains unmodified: devoid of form, flavour, touch,§ and smell, it exists unembodied|| and vast, and pervades the whole of space. Ether,¶ whose characteristic property and rudiment is sound, exists alone, occupying all the vacuity of space.** But then the radical element†† (egotism,) devours sound; and all the elements and faculties are, at once, merged into their original.‡‡ This primary element is consciousness,§§ combined with the property of darkness,|||| and is, itself, swallowed up by Mahat, whose characteristic property is intelligence;¶¶ and earth and Mahat are the inner and outer boundaries of the universe. In this manner,—as (in the creation,) were the seven forms of nature (Prakṙiti), reckoned from Mahat to earth,[1]***—so, at the (time of

---

[1] See Vol. I., p. 29.

---

* ततस्तु मूलमासाद्य वायुः संभवमात्मनः ।
ऊर्ध्वं चाधश्च तिर्यक्च दोधवीति दिशो दश ॥

† *Sparśa.*

‡ *Kha.*

§ *Sparśa.*

|| I find no reading but *múrttimat*, which means 'embodied'.

¶ *Ákáśa.* See Vol. I., p. 34, note *.

** परिमण्डलं तत्सुषिरमाकाशम् ।

†† *Bhútádi.* See Vol. I., p. 33, note *.

‡‡ भूतेन्द्रियेषु युगपद्भूतादौ संस्थितेषु वै ।

§§ अभिमानात्मकः । See Vol. I., p. 33, note ‡.

|||| This phrase is to render *támasa*, for which see Vol. I., p. 34, note 1, and p. 35, note *.

¶¶ *Buddhi.*

*** एवं सप्त महाबुद्धेः क्रमात्प्रकृतयस्तु वै ।

elemental) dissolution,* these seven successively re-enter into each other. The egg of Brahmá† is dissolved in the waters that surround it, with its seven zones,‡ seven oceans, seven regions, and their mountains. The investure of water is drunk up by fire; the (stratum of) fire is absorbed by (that of) air; air blends itself with ether; the primary element§ (of egotism) devours the ether, and is (itself,) taken up by intellect,|| which, along with all these, is seized upon by nature (Prakŕiti). Equilibrium of the (three) properties, without excess or deficiency, is called nature (Prakŕiti), origin (Hetu), the chief principle (Pradhańa),¶ cause (Kárańa), supreme (Para). This Prakŕiti is, essentially, the same, whether discrete or indiscrete; only that which is discrete is, finally, lost or absorbed in the indiscrete.** Spirit,†† also, which is one, pure, imperishable, eternal, all-pervading, is a portion of that supreme spirit which is all things. That spirit‡‡ which is other than (embodied) spirit, in which there are no attributes of name,

---

The seven *prakŕitis*, or productive productions, are, in the pure Sánkhya philosophy, *mahat*, *ahaṁkára*, and the five *tanmátras*. See the *Sánkhya-káriká*, III., and the commentaries.

With the statements in the text, which counts the seven *prakŕitis* from *mahá-buddhi*—the same as *mahat*,—compare Vol. I., p. 40.

* *Pratyáhára.*

† *Sarva-mańdala.*

‡ *Dwípa.*

§ *Bhútádi.*

|| *Mahat.*

¶ See Vol. I., p. 20, note *.

** इत्येषा प्रकृतिः सर्वा व्यक्ताव्यक्तस्वरूपिणी ।
व्यक्तं स्वरूपमव्यक्ते तस्मिन्मैत्रेय लीयते ॥

†† *Puṁs.*

‡‡ *Sarveśa.*

species,* or the like,—which is one with (all) wisdom, and is to be understood as (sole) existence,†—that is Brahma, infinite glory,‡ supreme spirit, supreme power,§ Vishńu, all that is; from whence the (perfect) sage|| returns no more. Nature (Prakŕiti)—which I have described to you as being, essentially, both discrete and indiscrete,—and spirit¶ (which is united with body), both resolve into supreme spirit. Supreme spirit is the upholder of all things, and the ruler of all things,** and is glorified, in the Vedas and in the Vedánta, by the name of Vishńu.

Works, as enjoined by the Vedas, are of two kinds, active (Pravŕitta) and quiescent (Nivŕitta), by both of which the universal person†† is worshipped by mankind. He, the lord of sacrifice,‡‡ the male of sacrifice,§§ the most excellent male,|||| is worshipped, by men, in the active mode, by rites enjoined in the Ŕig-, Yajur-, and Sáma-Vedas. The soul of wisdom, the person of wisdom,¶¶ Vishńu, the giver of emancipation, is worshipped, by sages,*** in the quiescent form, through medi-

---

* *Náman* and *játi*. *Vide supra*, p. 15, note *.

† *Sattá.*

‡ परं धाम ।

§ "Supreme power" is to render *íśwara.*

|| *Yati.*

¶ *Purusha.*

** This expression is to translate *parameśwara.*

†† *Sarva-múrtti.*

‡‡ *Yajneśwara.*

§§ *Yajna-puḿs.*

|||| *Purushottama.*

¶¶ *Jnána-múrtti.*

*** *Yogin.*

tative devotion.* The exhaustless† Vishńu is whatever thing that is designated by long, short, or prolated syllables, or that which is without a name. He is that which is discrete, and that which is indiscrete; he is exhaustless spirit, supreme spirit, universal spirit,‡ Hari, the wearer of universal forms. Nature, whether discrete or indiscrete, is absorbed into him; and (detached) spirit,§ also, merges into the all-diffusive|| and unobstructed spirit.¶ The period of two Parárdhas, as I have described it to you, Maitreya, is called a day of that potent Vishńu; and, whilst the products of nature are merged into their source, nature into spirit, and that into the Supreme, that period is termed his night, and is of equal duration with his day.** But, in fact, to that eternal supreme spirit there is neither day nor night; and these distinctions are only figuratively applied to the Almighty.†† I have, thus, explained to you the nature of elemental dissolution, and will now expound to you which is final.[1]

[1] The Bhágavata notices the Prákŕita pralaya much more briefly; and it is omitted in the Váyu.

* *Jnána-yoga.*

† *Ayvaya.* See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.

‡ *Viśwátman.*

§ *Purusha.*

|| *Vyápin.*

¶ *Átman.*

** व्यक्तौ च प्रकृतौ लीने प्रकृत्यां पुरुषे तथा ।
तत्र स्थिते निशा चान्या तत्प्रमाणा महामुने ॥

†† उपचारस्तथाप्येष तस्येशस्य द्विजोच्यते ।

CHAPTER V.

The third kind of dissolution, or final liberation from existence. Evils of worldly life. Sufferings in infancy, manhood, old age. Pains of hell. Imperfect felicity of heaven. Exemption from birth desirable by the wise. The nature of spirit or god. Meaning of the terms Bhagavat and Vásudeva.

THE wise man, having investigated the three kinds of worldly pain,*—or mental and bodily affliction, and the like,[1]—and having acquired (true) wisdom, and detachment (from human objects), obtains final dissolution. The first of the three pains, or Ádhyátmika, is of two kinds, bodily and mental. Bodily pain is of many kinds, as you shall hear. Affections of the head, catarrh, fever, cholic, fistula, spleen, hemorrhoids,† intumescence, sickness, ophthalmia, dysentery, leprosy, and many other diseases constitute bodily affliction. Mental sufferings are love, anger, fear, hate, covetousness, stupefaction,‡ despair, § sorrow, malice,|| disdain, jealousy, envy, and many other passions which are engendered in the mind. These and various other

[1] The three kinds of affliction,¶ inseparable, incidental, and superhuman, are fully described, in the commentary on the first verse of the Sánkhya Káriká, p. 8, in a similar strain as that which is adopted in the text.

* *Tápa-traya.*

† Here the original inserts *śwása*, 'asthma' (?).

‡ *Moha.*

§ *Vishádа.*

|| *Asúyá.*

¶ *Vide supra*, p. 60, note *.

(afflictions, mental or corporeal,) are comprised under the class of (worldly) sufferings, which is called Ádhyátmika (natural and inseparable). That pain to which, excellent Brahman, the term Ádhibhautika (natural, but incidental,) is applied, is every kind of evil which is inflicted* (from without,) upon men by beasts,† birds, men, goblins,‡ snakes, fiends,§ or reptiles;|| and the pain that is termed Ádhidaivika (or superhuman,) is the work of cold, heat, wind, rain,¶ lightning, and other (atmospherical phenomena). Affliction, Maitreya, is multiplied in thousands of shapes, in (the progress of) conception,** birth, decay, disease, death, and hell. The tender (and subtile) animal exists in the embryo,†† surrounded by abundant filth, floating in water,‡‡ and distorted in its back, neck, and bones; enduring severe pain, even in the course of its development,§§ as disordered by the acid, acrid,|||| bitter,¶¶ pungent,*** and saline articles of its mother's food; incapable of extending or contracting its limbs, reposing amidst the slime of ordure and urine, every way incommoded, unable to breathe, endowed with conscious-

---

* There is free interpolation here.

† *Mriga.*

‡ *Piśácha.*

§ *Rákshasa.*

|| *Sarisŕipa.*

¶ Insert 'water', *ambu.*

** *Garbha.*

†† *Garbha,* again.

‡‡ I find no Sanskrit for these words.

§§ वर्धमानातिवेदनः ।

|||| *Kaťu.*

¶¶ *Tikshńa.*

*** *Ushńa.*

ness,* and calling to memory many hundred (previous) births. Thus exists the embryo, in profound affliction, bound (to the world) by its (former) works.

When the child is about to be born, its face is besmeared by excrement, urine, blood, mucus,† and semen; its attachment to the uterus is ruptured‡ by the Prájápatya§ wind; it is turned head downwards, and violently expelled from the womb by the powerful and painful winds of parturition; and the infant, losing, for a time, all sensation, when brought in contact with the external air, is immediately deprived of its intellectual knowledge.|| Thus born, the child is tortured in every limb, as if pierced with thorns, or cut to pieces with a saw, and falls from its fetid lodgement, as from a sore, like a crawling thing, upon the earth.¶ Unable to feel** itself, unable to turn itself, it is dependent upon the will of others for being bathed†† and nourished. Laid upon a dirty bed,‡‡ it is bitten by insects and musquitoes,§§ and has not power to drive them away. Many are the pangs attending birth; and (many are those) which succeed to birth; and many are the

---

* *Sachaitanya.*

† There is no word for "mucus", in the original.

‡ पीड्यमानास्थिबन्धनः ।

§ Corrected from "Prájápati".

|| "Intellectual knowledge" is to render *vijnána.*

¶ कष्टकैरिव तुन्नाङ्गः क्रकचैरिव दारितः ।
पूतिव्रणान्निष्पतितो धरण्यां क्रिमिको यथा ॥

** The original, कण्डूयने चाप्यशक्तः, denotes scratching.

†† A variant yields 'drinking milk'.

‡‡ *Srastara,* with *prastara* as a variant. See Vol. III., p. 131, note *, and p. 150, note *.

§§ *Daṁśa,* 'gadflies.'

sufferings which are inflicted by elemental and superhuman agency, in the state of childhood.* Enveloped by the gloom of ignorance, and internally bewildered, man knows not whence he is, who he is, whither he goeth, nor what is his nature; by what bonds he is bound; what is cause, and what is not cause; what is to be done, and what is to be left undone;† what is to be said, and what is to be kept silent; what is righteousness, what is iniquity; in what it consists, or how; what is right, what is wrong;‡ what is virtue, what is vice. Thus, man, like a brute beast, addicted only to animal gratifications, suffers the pain that ignorance occasions.§ Ignorance, darkness, inactivity influence those devoid of knowledge, so that pious works are neglected;‖ but hell is the consequence of neglect of (religious) acts, according to the great sages; and the ignorant, therefore, suffer affliction both in this world and in the next.

When old age arrives, the body is infirm; the limbs are relaxed; the face is emaciate and shrivelled;¶ the skin is wrinkled, and scantily covers the veins and

---

* बालभावे यदाप्नोति आधिभौतादिकानि च ।

† किं कार्यं किमकार्यं वा । I should prefer "what is effect, and what is not effect", considering what we meet with just below. See the next note.

‡ किं कर्तव्यमकर्तव्यं किम् । "What is to be done, *and* what is not to be done."

§ एवं पशुसमैर्मूढैरज्ञानप्रभवं महत् ।
अवाप्यते नरैर्दुःखं शिश्नोदरपरायणैः ॥

‖ अज्ञानं तामसो भावः कार्यारम्भाप्रवृत्तयः ।
अज्ञानिनां प्रवर्तन्ते कर्मलोपास्ततो द्विज ॥

¶ Rather, "the teeth decay and fall out:" विगलच्छीर्णदशनः । This is the only good reading that I find.

sinews;* the eye discerns not afar off, and the pupil gazes on vacuity; the nostrils are stuffed with hair; the trunk trembles (as it moves); the bones appear (beneath the surface); the back is bowed, and the joints are bent; the digestive fire is extinct, and there is little appetite and little vigour;† walking, rising, sleeping, sitting are (all,) painful efforts; the ear is dull; the eye is dim; the mouth is disgusting with dribbling saliva;‡ the senses no longer are obedient to the will; and, as death approaches, the things that are perceived even are immediately forgotten.§ The utterance of a single sentence is fatiguing; and wakefulness is perpetuated by (difficult) breathing, coughing, and (painful) exhaustion. The old man is lifted up by somebody else; he is clothed by somebody else; he is an object of contempt to his servants, his children, and his wife. Incapable of cleanliness, of amusement, or food, or desire, he is laughed at by his dependants, and disregarded by his kin; and, dwelling on the exploits of his youth, as on the actions of a past life,‖ he sighs deeply, and is sorely distressed. Such are some of the pains which old age is condemned to suffer. I will now describe to you the agonies of death.

The neck droops; the feet and hands are relaxed; the body trembles; the man is, repeatedly, exhausted,

---

* वलिस्नायुशिरावृतः ।

† *Cheshṫita,* 'activity.'

‡ स्रवज्ञालाविलाननः ।

§ अनायत्तैः समस्तैश्च करणैर्मरणोन्मुखः ।
तत्क्षणेऽप्यनुभूतानामस्मर्ताखिलवस्तुनाम् ॥

‖ "Past life," in the sense of previous state of existence. The original expression is अन्यस्मिञ्जन्मनि ।

subdued, and visited with interrupted knowledge.* The principle of selfishness afflicts him, and he thinks: "What will become of my wealth, my lands,† my children, my wife, my servants, my house?" The joints of his limbs are tortured with severe pains, as if cut by a saw, or as if they were pierced by the sharp arrows of the destroyer;‡ he rolls his eyes, and tosses about his hands and feet; his lips and palate are parched and dry; and his throat, obstructed by foul humours and deranged vital airs,§ emits a rattling sound; he is afflicted with burning heat, and with thirst, and with hunger; and he, at last, passes away, tortured by the servants of the judge of the dead,|| to undergo a renewal of his sufferings in another body. These are the agonies which men have to endure, when they die. I will now describe to you the tortures which they suffer in hell.

Men are bound, when they die, by the servants of the king of Tartarus,¶ with cords, and beaten with sticks, and have, then, to encounter the fierce aspect of Yama, and the horrors of their terrible route. In the different hells there are various intolerable tortures with burning sand,** fire, machines, and weapons: some

---

* श्लथग्रीवाङ्घ्रिहस्तोऽथ व्याप्तो वेपथुना नरः ।
मुहुर्ग्लानिः परवशो मुहुर्ज्ञानलवान्वितः ॥

† *Dhánya*, 'grain.'

‡ The Sanskrit has Antaka, the same as Yama. *Vide supra*, p. 15, note §§.

§ This is a free rendering.

|| याम्यकिङ्करपीडितः ।

¶ याम्यकिङ्कर° ।

** करम्भवालुकाः । Compare the *Laws of the Mánavas*, XII., 76.

are severed with saws; some, roasted in forges;* some are chopped with axes; some, buried in the ground; some are mounted on stakes; some, cast to wild beasts,† (to be devoured); some are gnawed by vultures; some, torn by tigers;‡ some are boiled in oil; some, rolled in caustic slime;§ some are precipitated from great heights; some, tossed (upwards) by engines. The number of punishments inflicted in hell, which are the consequences of sin, is infinite.[1]

But not in hell alone do the souls of the deceased undergo pain: there is no cessation, even in heaven; for its temporary inhabitant is ever tormented with the prospect of descending again to earth.|| Again is he liable to conception and to birth; he is merged again into the embryo, and repairs to it, when about to be born; then he dies, as soon as born, or in infancy, or in youth, or in old age. Death, sooner or later, is inevitable.¶ As long as he lives, he is immersed in manifold afflictions, like the seed of the cotton amidst the down** that is to be spun into thread. In acquiring,

[1] Some further particulars of the different hells, and the punishments inflicted in them, have been given before. See Vol. II., pp. 214, *et seq*.

* *Múshá*, 'crucibles.'

† व्याघ्रवक्त्रे ।

‡ *Dwipin*, 'ounces', or 'panthers'.

§ क्षारकर्दमे ।

|| न केवलं द्विजश्रेष्ठ नरके दुःखपद्धतिः ।
स्वर्गेऽपि पातभीतस्य क्षयिष्णोर्नास्ति निर्वृतिः ॥

¶ This sentence is to render ध्रुवा मृतिः ।

** *Pakshman*, 'filaments.'

losing, and preserving wealth, there are many griefs; and so there are in the misfortunes of our friends.* Whatever (is produced that) is (most) acceptable to man, that, Maitreya, becomes a seed whence springs the tree of sorrow. Wife, children, servants, house, lands, riches contribute much more to the misery, than to the happiness, of mankind. Where could man, scorched by the fires of the sun of this world,† look for felicity, were it not for the shade afforded by the tree of emancipation? Attainment of the divine being is considered, by the wise, as the remedy of the three-fold class of ills that beset the different stages of life, —conception, birth, and decay,—as characterized by that only happiness which effaces all other kinds of felicity, however abundant, and as being absolute and final.[1] ‡

It should, therefore, be the assiduous endeavour of wise men to attain unto God.[2] The means of such at-

[1] All this is conformable to the Sánkhya doctrines, in particular, although the same spirit pervades all Hindu metaphysics.

[2] Tasmát Tat práptaye yatnaḿ kartavyaḿ pańditair naraiḿ:

तस्मात्तत्प्राप्तये यत्नः कर्तव्यः पण्डितैर्नरैः ।

The expression Tat-práptaye, "for the obtaining of *that*," refers to the phrase immediately preceding,—Bhagavat-práptiḿ, "obtaining of," or "attaining to, Bhagavat," the Lord.

* तथैवेष्टविपत्तिषु ।

† *Saḿsára.*

‡ तदस्य त्रिविधस्यापि दुःखजातस्य पण्डितैः ।
गर्भजन्मजराद्येषु स्थानेषु प्रभविष्यतः ॥
निरस्तातिशयाह्लादसुखभावैकलक्षणा ।
भेषजं भगवत्प्राप्तिरेकान्तात्यन्तिकी मता ॥

tainment are said, great Muni, to be knowledge and works. Knowledge is of two kinds,—that which is derived from scripture, and that which is derived from reflection.* Brahma that is the word is composed of scripture; Brahma that is supreme is produced of reflection.[1] Ignorance is utter darkness, in which knowledge obtained through any sense (as that of hearing,) shines like a lamp; but the knowledge that is derived from reflection breaks upon the obscurity like the sun.† What has been said by Manu, when appealing to the meaning of the Vedas, with respect to this subject, I will repeat to you.‡ There are two (forms of) spirit (or God),—the spirit which is the word, and the spirit which is supreme. He who is thoroughly imbued with the word of God obtains supreme spirit.[2] The Atharva Veda, also, states that there are two kinds of know-

---

[1] Brahma is of two kinds; Śabda-Brahma,—spirit, or God, to be attained through the word (that is, the Vedas,) and the duties they prescribe; and Para-Brahma,—spirit, or God, to be attained through reflection, by which the difference between soul and matter is ascertained.

[2] This seems intended as a quotation from Manu; but it has not been found in the code. It is:

द्वे ब्रह्मणी वेदितव्ये शब्दब्रह्म परं च यत्।
शब्दब्रह्मणि निष्णातः परं ब्रह्माधिगच्छति ॥ §

---

* *Viveka.*

† अन्धं तम इवाज्ञानं दीपवच्चेन्द्रियोद्भवम्।
यथा सूर्यस्तथा ज्ञानं यद्विप्रर्षे विवेकजम् ॥

‡ मनुरप्याह वेदार्थं स्मृत्वा यन्मुनिसत्तम।
तदेतच्छ्रूयतामत्र संबन्धे गदतो मम ॥

§ This stanza appears in the *Maitri-upanishad*, VI., 22; and it occurs in the *Mahábhárata*, *Śánti-parvan*, *śl.* 8550, 8551.

ledge. By (the one which is) the supreme, God* is attained; the other is that which consists of the Ṛich and other Vedas.[1] That which is imperceptible, undecaying, inconceivable, unborn, inexhaustible,† indescribable; which has neither form, nor hands, nor feet;‡ which is almighty,§ omnipresent, eternal; the cause of all things, and without cause; permeating all, itself unpenetrated, and from which all things proceed,—that is the object which the wise behold, that is Brahma, that is the supreme state, that is the subject of contemplation to those who desire liberation, that is the thing spoken of by the Vedas, the infinitely subtile, supreme condition of Vishńu.|| That essence of the Supreme¶ is de-

---

[1] The commentator quotes other passages from the Vedas, of a similar tendency; intimating, however, the necessity of performing acts prior to attaining knowledge; as: कषाये कर्मभिः पक्के ततो ज्ञानं तु परमा गतिः।** "The decoction (preparatory process) being digested by rites, thereafter knowledge is the supreme resource."

अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययामृतमश्नुते।

"Having crossed the gulf of death by ignorance (ceremonial acts), man obtains immortality by (holy) knowledge."

---

* *Akshara.*

† *Avyaya.* See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.

‡ Compare Vol. IV., p. 253.

§ *Vibhu.*

|| श्रुतिवाक्योदितं सूक्ष्मं तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम्।

¶ *Paramátman.*

** This seems to be a selection from the following stanza, cited by the commentator Ratnagarbha:

कषायपङ्क्तिः कर्माणि ज्ञानं तु परमा गतिः।
कषाये कर्मभिः पक्के ततो ज्ञानं प्रवर्तते॥

fined by the term Bhagavat.[1] The word Bhagavat is the denomination of that primeval and eternal god;* and he who fully understands the meaning of that expression is possessed of holy wisdom,—the sum and substance of the three Vedas.† The word Bhagavat is a convenient form to be used in the adoration of that supreme being‡ to whom no term is applicable; and, therefore, Bhagavat expresses that Supreme Spirit, which is individual, almighty, and the cause of causes of all things.§ The letter *Bha* implies the cherisher and supporter (of the universe). By *ga* is understood the leader, impeller, or creator. The dissyllable *Bhaga* indicates the six properties,—dominion, might, glory, splendour, wisdom and dispassion.|| The purport of

---

[1] According to the comment, allusion is here made to the twelve-syllable Mantra (or mystic formula) addressed to Vishńu: "Oḿ Bhagavate Vásudeváya namaḣ;¶ 'Om! Salutation to Bhagavat Vásudeva:' the repetition of which, by those devoted (bhakta) to Vishńu, is the easy mode of securing their liberation." The mysticism is, however, no doubt, older than the worship of Vishńu; and the term Bhagavat is defined, in the text, according to the interpretation of the Vedas.

---

* *Átman.*

† एवं निगदितार्थस्य सतत्वं तस्य तत्त्वतः ।
ज्ञायते येन तज्ज्ञानं परमं यत्त्रयीमयम् ॥

‡ *Brahma.*

§ शुद्धे महाविभूत्याख्ये परे ब्रह्मणि वर्तते ।
मैत्रेय भगवच्छब्दः सर्वकारणकारणे ॥

|| ऐश्वर्यस्य समग्रस्य धर्मस्य यशसः श्रियः ।
ज्ञानवैराग्ययोश्चैव षण्णां भग इतीङ्गना ॥

¶ See Vol. I., p. 99, note *.

the letter *va* is that elemental spirit in which all beings exist, and which exists in all beings.[1]* And, thus, this great word Bhagavat is the name of Vásudeva,—who is one with the supreme Brahma,—and of no one else. This word, therefore, which is the general denomination of an adorable object, is not used, in reference to the Supreme, in a general, but a special, signification. When applied to any other (thing or person), it is used in its customary or general import.† In the latter case, it may purport one who knows the origin, and end, and revolutions of beings, and what is wisdom,‡ what ignorance. In the former, it denotes wisdom,§ energy, power, dominion, might, glory, without end, and without defect.||

The term Vásudeva means, that all beings abide in that Supreme Being, and that he abides in all beings;[2] as was formerly explained by Keśidhwaja to Khándi-

---

[1] The commentator says, these interpretations are from the Nirukta,—the glossary of the Vedas. The more etymological derivation of the term is: Bhaga, 'power,' 'authority,' and vat, possessive affix.

[2] From the root Vas (वस्), 'abiding,' 'dwelling.' See Vol. I., pp. 1 and 17.

---

* वसन्ति यत्र भूतानि भूतात्मन्यखिलात्मनि ।
सर्वभूतेष्वशेषेषु वकारार्थस्ततोऽव्ययः ॥

† तत्र पूज्यपदार्थोक्तिपरिभाषासमन्वितः ।
शब्दोऽयं नोपचारेण अन्यत्र ह्युपचारतः ॥

‡ *Vidyá.*

§ *Jnána.*

|| विना हेयैर्गुणादिभिः ।

kya, called Janaka,* when he inquired of him an explanation of the name of the immortal,† Vásudeva. He said: "He dwelleth internally in all beings; and all things dwell in him; and, thence, the lord Vásudeva is the creator and preserver‡ of the world. He, though one with all beings, is beyond and separate from material nature (Prakŕiti), from its products, from properties, from imperfections; he is beyond all investing substance; he is universal soul. All the interstices of the universe are filled up by him.§ He is one with all good qualities; and all created beings are endowed with but a small portion of his individuality.|| Assuming, at will, various forms, he bestows benefits on the whole world, which was his work.¶ Glory, might, dominion, wisdom,** energy, power, and other attributes are collected in him. Supreme of the supreme, in whom no imperfections†† abide, lord over finite and infinite,‡‡

---

* *Vide infra*, p. 217, notes 1, *, and ‡.

† *Ananta.*

‡ "Creator" and "preserver" are to render *dhátŕi* and *vidhátŕi*; for which *vide supra*, p. 15, note ¶.

§ स सर्वभूतः प्रकृतिं विकारा-
न्गुणांश्च दोषांश्च मुने व्यतीतः ।
अतीतसर्वावरणोऽखिलात्मा
तेनास्तृतं यद्भुवनान्तराले ॥

Instead of स सर्वभूतः प्रकृतिं, the stanza begins with स सर्वभूत-प्रकृतिं, according to several MSS.

|| *Śakti.*

¶ इच्छागृहीताभिमतोरुदेहः
संसाधिताशेषजगद्धितोऽसौ ।

** *Mahávabodha.*

†† *Kleśa.*

‡‡ *Parápareśa.*

god in individuals and universals,* visible and invisible, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, almighty. The wisdom, perfect,† pure, supreme, undefiled, and one only, by which he is conceived, contemplated, and known,—that is wisdom: all else is ignorance."

* व्यष्टिसमष्टिरूपः। See Vol. IV., p. 255, note §. The commentators concrete *vyashṫi* into Sankarshańa, &c., and *samashṫi* into Vásudeva.

† *Asta-dosha.*

CHAPTER VI.

Means of attaining liberation. Anecdotes of Khándikya and Keśidhwaja. The former instructs the latter how to atone for permitting the death of a cow. Keśidhwaja offers him a requital; and he desires to be instructed in spiritual knowledge.

HE, Purushottama, is, also, known by holy study* and devout meditation;† and either, as the cause of attaining him, is entitled Brahma. From study let a man proceed to meditation,‡ and from meditation to study:[1] by perfection in both, supreme spirit becomes manifest. Study is one eye, wherewith to behold it; and meditation is the other. He who is one with Brahma sees not with the eye of flesh.§

MAITREYA.—Reverend teacher, I am desirous of being informed what is meant by the term meditation (Yoga), by understanding which I may behold the Supreme Being, the upholder of the universe.

---

[1] Both study of the Vedas (Swádhyáya) and abstraction (Yoga) are to be practised. When a man is weary of one, he may apply to the other. The Yoga,|| however, limits the practical part to silent prayer.

जपाच्छ्रान्तः पुनर्ध्यायेद्ध्यानाच्छ्रान्तः पुनर्जपेत् ।

"Wearied of meditation, let him pray inaudibly: weary of prayer, let him repeat meditation."

जपध्यानाभियोगेन पश्येदात्मानमात्मनि ।

"By the union of prayer and meditation let him behold soul in himself."

---

* *Swádhyáya. Vide infra*, p. 229, note §. † *Saṁyama*. ‡ *Yoga*.

§ न मांसचक्षुषा द्रष्टुं ब्रह्मभूतः स शक्यते ।

|| The verses quoted by the Translator are given by both the commentators, and as from the *Yoga-śástra*.

Parásara.—I will repeat to you (Maitreya,) the explanation formerly given by Keśidhwaja to the magnanimous Kháńdikya, also called Janaka.*

Maitreya,—Tell me, first, Brahman, who Kháńdikya was, and who was Keśidhwaja; and how it happened, that a conversation relating to (the practice of) Yoga occurred between them.

Parásara.—There was Janaka, (named) Dharmadhwaja, who had two sons, Mitadhwaja and Kŕitadhwaja; and the latter was a king ever intent upon existent supreme spirit:† his son was the celebrated Keśidhwaja. The son of Mitadhwaja was Janaka, called Kháńdikya.[1] ‡ Kháńdikya was diligent in the way of works, and was renowned, on earth, for religious rites. Keśidhwaja, on the other hand, was endowed with spiritual knowledge. These two were engaged in hostilities; and Kháńdikya was driven from his principality by Keśidhwaja. Expelled from his dominions, he wandered, with a few followers, his priest, and his counsellors, amidst woods and mount-

---

[1] No such names occur amongst the Maithila kings of the Vishńu Puráńa (see Vol. III., pp. 330, *et seq.*); but, as there noticed (p. 333, note 2§), the Bhágavata inserts them. Janaka is used as a title. Kŕitadhwaja, in some of the copies, is read Ŕitadhwaja.

---

* That is to say, Janaka, son of Kháńdika. In the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, IX., XIII., 20, he is called son of Mitadhwaja; and, the original of the *Vishńu-puráńa* being ambiguous, I have corrected accordingly Professor Wilson's "Amitadhwaja", just below. Mitadhwaja was patronymically called Kháńdika; and his father must have been called Khańdika, with other names.

† सदाध्यात्मरतिर्नृपः ।

‡ Here, as in p. 214, *supra*, the original does not yield "Janaka, called Kháńdikya", but Kháńdikyajanaka. Also see note *, above.

§ But also see note ***, in the page referred to.

ains, where, destitute of true wisdom, he performed many sacrifices, expecting, thereby, to obtain divine truth, and to escape from death by ignorance.[1]*

Once, whilst the best of those who are skilled in devotion † (Keśidhwaja,) was engaged in devout exercises, ‡ a fierce tiger slew his milch-cow,[2] in the lonely forest. When the Raja heard that the cow had been killed, he asked the ministering priests what form of penance would expiate the crime. They replied, that they did not know, and referred him to Kaśeru. Kaśeru, § when the Raja consulted him, told him that he knew not, but that Śunaka would be able to tell him. Accordingly, the Raja went to Śunaka; but he replied: "I am as unable, great king, to answer your question as Kaśeru has been; and there is no one now, upon earth, who can give you the information, except your enemy Kháńdikya, whom you have conquered."

Upon receiving this answer, Keśidhwaja said: "I will go, then, and pay a visit to my foe. If he kill me, no

---

[1] The performance of rites, as a means of salvation, is called ignorance, in the Vedas (*vide supra*, p. 211, note 1). Works are recommended as introductory to the acquirement of knowledge: it is ignorance to consider them as finite.

[2] Tasya dhenum (तस्य धेनुम्). One copy has Homa-dhenum, 'cow of sacrifice;' another, Dharma-dhenum, || 'cow of righteousness.' The commentator explains the terms as importing the same thing,—a cow yielding milk for holy purposes, or for the butter which is poured, in oblations, upon the sacrificial fire.

---

* ब्रह्मविद्यामधिष्ठाय तर्तुं मृत्युमविद्यया।

† All my MSS. have the vocative योगविदां वर। ‡ *Yoga.*

§ The original calls him a Bhárgava, or descendant of Bhŕigu.

|| *Dharma-dogdhrím* is the only variant noticed by Śrídhara or Ratnagarbha; and the former explains it by *homa-dhenum.*

matter; for, then, I shall obtain the reward that attends being killed in a holy cause.* If (on the contrary,) he tell me what penance to perform, then my sacrifice will be unimpaired in efficacy." Accordingly, he ascended his car, having clothed himself in the deer-skin (of the religious student), and went to the forest where the wise Kháńd̍ikya resided. When Kháńd̍ikya beheld him approach, his eyes reddened with rage, and he took up his bow, and said to him: "You have armed yourself with the deer-skin, to accomplish my destruction; imagining, that, in such an attire, you will be safe from me. But, fool, the deer upon whose backs this skin is seen are slain, by you and me, with sharp arrows. So will I slay you: you shall not go free, whilst I am living. You are an unprincipled felon, who have robbed me of my kingdom, and are deserving of death."† To this, Keśidhwaja answered: "I have come hither, Kháńd̍ikya, to ask you to solve my doubts, and not with any hostile intention. Lay aside, therefore, both your arrow and your anger." Thus spoken to, Kháńd̍ikya retired, awhile, with his counsellors and his priest, and consulted with them what course to pursue. They strongly urged him to slay Keśidhwaja, who was now in his power, and by whose death he would again become the monarch of the whole earth. Kháńd̍ikya replied to them: "It is, no doubt, true, that, by such an act, I should become the monarch of the whole earth. He, however, would, thereby, conquer

---

* स चाहृ तं प्रयास्येष प्रष्टुमात्मरिपुं मुने ।
प्राप्त एव मया यज्ञो यदि मां स हनिष्यति ॥

† The translation is free hereabouts, as throughout the rest of the Chapter.

the world to come; whilst the earth would be mine. Now, if I do not kill him, I shall subdue the next world, and leave him this earth. It seems to me, that this world is not of more value than the next: for the subjugation of the next world endures for ever; the conquest over this is but for a brief season. I will, therefore, not kill him, but tell him what he wishes to know."

Returning, then, to Keśidhwaja, Kháńd́ikya* desired him to propose his question, which he promised to answer; and Keśidhwaja related to him what had happened,—the death of the cow,†—and demanded to know what penance he should perform. Kháńd́ikya, in reply, explained to him, fully, the expiation that was suited to the occasion; and Keśidhwaja then, with his permission, returned to the place of sacrifice, and regularly fulfilled every necessary act. Having completed the ceremony, with its supplementary rites, Keśidhwaja accomplished all his objects. But he then reflected thus: "The priests whom I invited to attend have, all, been duly honoured; all those who had any request to make have been gratified by compliance with their desires; all that is proper for this world has been effected by me. Why, then, should my mind feel as if my duty had been unfulfilled?" So meditating, he remembered that he had not presented to Kháńd́ikya the gift that it is becoming to offer to a spiritual preceptor; and, mounting his chariot, he immediately set off to the thick forest where that sage abode. Kháńd́ikya, upon his reappearance, assumed his weapons, to kill him. But Keśidhwaja exclaimed: "Forbear,

* The original has Kháńd́ikyajanaka.

† *Dharma-dhenu.*

venerable sage. I am not here to injure you, Kháńd̈ikya. Dismiss your wrath; and know that I have come hither to offer you that remuneration which is due to you, as my instructor. Through your lessons I have fully completed my sacrifice; and I am, therefore, desirous to give you a gift. Demand what it shall be."

Kháńd̈ikya, having once more communed with his counsellors, told them the purpose of his rival's visit, and asked them what he should demand. His friends recommended him to require his whole kingdom back again; as kingdoms are obtained, by prudent men, without conflicting hosts. The reflecting king Kháńd̈ikya laughed, and replied to them; "Why should a person such as I be desirous of a temporary earthly kingdom? Of a truth, you are able counsellors in the concerns of this life; but of those of the life to come you are, assuredly, ignorant." So speaking, he went back to Keśidhwaja, and said to him: "Is it true that you wish to make me a gift, as to your preceptor?" "Indeed, I do," answered Keśidhwaja. "Then," rejoined Kháńd̈ikya, "as it is known that you are learned in the spiritual learning that teaches the doctrine of the soul, if you will communicate that knowledge to me, you will have discharged your debt to your instructor. Declare to me what acts are efficacious for the alleviation of human affliction."*

* बाढमित्येव तेनोक्तः खाण्डिक्यस्तमथाब्रवीत् ।
भवानध्यात्मविज्ञानपरमार्थविचक्षणः ॥
यदि चेद्दीयते मह्यं भवता गुरुनिष्क्रयः ।
तत्क्लेशप्रशमायालं यत्कर्म तदुदीरय ॥

CHAPTER VII.

Keśidhwaja describes the nature of ignorance, and the benefits of the Yoga or contemplative devotion. Of the novice and the adept in the performance of the Yoga. How it is performed. The first stage, proficiency in acts of restraint and moral duty: the second, particular mode of sitting: the third, Práńáyáma, modes of breathing: the fourth, Pratyáhára, restraint of thought: the fifth, apprehension of spirit:* the sixth, retention of the idea. Meditation on the individual and universal forms of Vishńu. Acquirement of knowledge. Final liberation.

"BUT," said Keśidhwaja, "why have you not asked of me my kingdom, now free from all annoyance? What else except dominion is acceptable to the warrior race?" "I will tell you," replied Kháńdikya, "why I did not make such a demand, nor require that territory which is an object of ignorant ambition. It is the duty of the warrior to protect his subjects (in peace), and to kill, in fight, the enemies of his sway. It is no fault, that you should have taken my kingdom from one who was unable to defend it, to whom it was a bondage, and who was, thus, freed from the incumbrance of ignorance. My desire of dominion originated in my being born to possess it. The ambition of others, which proceeds from (human) frailties, is not compatible with virtue. To solicit gifts is not the duty of a prince and warrior; and, for these reasons, I have not asked for your kingdom, nor made a demand which ignorance

* By referring to note † in p. 240, *infra*, it will be seen that *yama* and *niyama* are the first and second stages, while "apprehension of spirit", *bhávaná*, should not be counted as a stage.

alone would have suggested.* Those only who are destitute of knowledge, whose minds are engrossed by selfishness,† who are intoxicated with the inebriating beverage of self-sufficiency,‡ desire kingdoms,—not such as I am."

When King Keśidhwaja heard these words, he was much pleased, and exclaimed: "It is well-spoken." § Then, addressing Khāṅḍikya || affectionately, he said: "Listen to my words. Through desire of escaping death by the ignorance of works, I exercise the regal power, celebrate various sacrifices, and enjoy pleasures subversive of purity. Fortunate is it for you, that your mind has attached itself to the dominion of discrimination. Pride of your race! now listen to the real nature of ignorance. The (erroneous) notion that self consists in what is not self, and the opinion that property consists in what is not one's own, ¶ constitute the double seed of the tree of ignorance. The ill-judging embodied being, bewildered by the darkness of fascination, situated in a body composed of the five elements, loudly asserts 'This is I.' But who would ascribe spiritual individuality to a body in which soul is distinct from the ether, air, fire, water, and earth, (of

---

* न याञ्चा क्षत्रबन्धूनां धर्मो ह्येतत्सतां मतम् ।
अतो न याचितं राज्यमविद्यान्तर्गतं तव ॥

The translation of the a large part of the present Chapter is not at all close.

† *Mamatwa.*

‡ *Ahaṁ-māna.*

§ 'Enough!' साध्वीति प्राह । A sacred license of grammar is here taken, as is remarked by the commentators.

|| The original has Khāṅḍikyajanaka.

¶ अस्वे स्वमिति या मतिः ।

which that body is composed)?[1] What man of understanding assigns to disembodied* spirit corporeal fruition, or houses, lands, and the like, that it should say 'These are mine'? What wise man entertains the idea of property in sons or grandsons, begotten of the body, after the spirit has abandoned it?† Man performs all acts, for the purpose of bodily fruition; and the consequence of such acts is another body; so that their result is nothing but confinement to bodily existence.‡ In the same manner as a mansion of clay is plastered with clay and water, so the body, which is of earth, is perpetuated by earth and water, (or by eating and drinking). The body, consisting of the five elements, is nourished by substances equally composed of those elements. But, since this is the case, what is there in this life that man should be proud of?§ Travelling the path of the world|| for many thousands of births, man attains only the weariness of bewilderment, and is smothered by the dust of imagination.¶ When that dust is

[1] The text is somewhat obscure; but it is, in some degree, cleared up by the next illustration. No one would think of applying the property of self—the idea of possession, or personality,—to soul separated from body. But the objection is equally applicable to soul in the body; for, whilst there, it is as distinct, in its nature, from the materials of body, as if it was disembodied, and quite as incapable of individual personal fruition.

* *Adeha.*

† This clause is to render अनात्मनि कलेवरे।

‡ देहस्त्वान्यो यदा पुंसस्तदा बन्धाय तत्परम्।

§ I find no Sanskrit answering to this sentence.

|| *Saṁsára.*

¶ *Vásaná.*

washed away by the bland* water of (real) knowledge, then the weariness of bewilderment sustained by the wayfarer through repeated births is removed. When that weariness is relieved, the internal man is at peace, and he obtains that supreme felicity which is unequalled and undisturbed.† This soul is (of its own nature,) pure, and composed of happiness‡ and wisdom. The properties of pain, ignorance, and impurity are those of nature (Prakŕiti), not of soul. There is no affinity between fire and water; but, when the latter is placed over the former, in a caldron, it bubbles, and boils, and exhibits the properties of fire.§ In like manner, when soul is associated with Prakŕiti, it is vitiated by egotism|| and the rest, and assumes the qualities of grosser nature, although essentially distinct from them, and incorruptible.¶ Such is the seed of ignorance, as I have explained it to you. There is but one cure of worldly sorrows,—the practice of devotion: no other is known."**

"Then," said Kháńdikya, "do you, who are the chief of those versed in contemplative devotion, explain to me what that is: for, in the race of the descendants of Nimi,[1]†† you are best acquainted with the sacred writ-

---

[1] That is, in the race of princes of Mithilá.

---

* *Ushńa.*

† अनन्यातिशयाबाधं परं निर्वाणमृच्छति ।

‡ *Nirváńa-maya.*

§ जलस्य नाग्निसंसर्गः स्थालीसंगात्तथापि हि ।
शब्दोद्रेकादिकान्धर्मांस्तत्करोति यथा मुने ॥

|| *Ahaṁ-mána.*

¶ *Avyaya.* See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.

** क्लेशानां च क्षयकरं योगादन्यन्न विद्यते ।

†† See Vol. III., pp. 259 and 327.

ings in which it is taught." "Hear," replied Keśidhwaja, "the account of the nature of contemplative devotion,[1] which I impart to you, and by perfection in which the sage attains resolution into Brahma, and never suffers birth again.* The mind of man is the cause both of his bondage and his liberation: its addiction to the objects of sense is the means of his bondage; its separation from objects of sense† is the means of his freedom. The sage who is capable of discriminative knowledge must, therefore, restrain his mind from all the objects of sense, and therewith meditate upon the Su-

---

[1] The term Yoga (योग), which is that used in the text, in its literal acceptation signifies 'union,' 'junction,' from युज् 'to join': in a spiritual sense, it denotes "union of separated with universal soul;" and, with some latitude of expression, it comes to signify the means by which such union is effected. In the Bhagavad Gítá, it is variously applied, but, ordinarily, denotes the performance of religious ceremonies as a duty, and not for interested purposes. Thus, Kŕishńa says to Arjuna:

योगस्थः कुरु कर्माणि संगं त्यक्त्वा धनंजय ।
सिद्ध्यसिद्ध्योः समो भूत्वा समत्वं योग उच्यते ॥

"Engaging in Yoga, perform rites, Dhananjaya, being indifferent to success or failure. Such indifference is called Yoga." II., verse 48. It is elsewhere defined "exemption from the contact of pain:" दुःखसंयोगवियोगं योगसंज्ञितम् । VI., verse 23. The word has been, accordingly, rendered 'devotion', by Wilkins, and 'devotio', by Schlegel, in their translations of the Gítá. In this place, however, it is used in a less general sense, and signifies, as is subsequently explained, reunion with spirit, through the exercises necessary to perfect abstraction, as they are taught and practised by the followers of Patanjali.

---

* यत्र स्थितो न च्यवते प्राप्य ब्रह्मलयं मुनिः ।

† *Nirvishaya.*

preme Being,—who is one with spirit,—in order to attain liberation.* For that Supreme Spirit† attracts (to itself) him who meditates upon it, and who is of the same nature; as the loadstone attracts the iron by the virtue which is common to itself and to its products.[1]‡ Contemplative devotion is the union with Brahma, effected by that condition of mind which has attained perfection through those exercises which complete the control of self;[2] and he whose contemplative devotion

---

[1] This illustration is, however, only to a limited extent explanatory of the nature of Yoga; for, though the loadstone and iron unite, by virtue of a community of kind, yet the union that takes place is only that of contiguity, Saṁyoga (संयोग), not that of identification or unity, Tad-aikya (तदैक्य). Some further explanation, therefore, is required.

[2] The first stage is the Átma-prayatna, the practice of moral and religious restraint,—Yama, Niyama,§ &c. When the novice is perfect in these, then he is fit to attain the perfectibility of an adept, through the especial practices which treatises on the Yoga prescribe. When the mind has attained the state which can alone be attained through them, then the union with Brahma, which is the consequence, is called Yoga:

आत्मप्रयत्नसापेक्षा विशिष्टा या मनोगतिः ।
तस्या ब्रह्मणि संयोगो योग इत्यभिधीयते ॥ ||

The Átma-prayatna is defined¶ to be that which has Yama, &c.

---

* विषयेभ्यः समाहृत्य विज्ञानात्मा मनो मुनिः ।
चिन्तयेन्मुक्तये तेन ब्रह्मभूतं परेश्वरम् ॥

† "Supreme Spirit" is for Brahma.

‡ विकार्यमात्मनः शक्त्या लोहमाकर्षको यथा ।

§ *Vide infra*, p. 230, notes * and †.

|| This is the original of the passage to which the Translator's note is attached.

¶ By the commentator Śridhara, whom Ratnagarbha here closely follows.

is characterized by the property of such absolute perfection is, in truth, a sage, expectant of final liberation from the world.*

"The sage (or Yogin), when first applying himself to contemplative devotion, is called the (novice or) practitioner (Yoga-yuj); when he has attained spiritual union,† he is termed (the adept, or) he whose meditations are accomplished.[1] Should the thoughts of the

---

for its object, यमनियमादिविषयः। The next phrase, तत्सापेक्षा, is explained तदधीना 'depending upon, or relating to, such control.' मनोगतिः is the same as मनोवृत्तिः, condition or state of mind which is विशिष्टा, 'perfected:' of that state of mind union with Brahma is Yoga. Union with Brahma is the abstraction that proposes the identity of the living with the supreme spirit, — of the Jívátman‡ with Brahma: जीवात्मब्रह्मैक्यविषयत्वम्। And Yoga is understanding of the identity of the contemplator and the object contemplated: ध्यातृध्येयैक्यधीः। A text of Yájnavalkya§ is quoted to this effect: ||

ज्ञानं योगात्मकं विद्धि योगश्चाष्टाङ्गसंयुतः।
संयोगो योग इत्युक्तो जीवात्मपरमात्मनोः॥

"Know holy wisdom to be the same with Yoga, (the practice of) which has eight divisions. That which is termed Yoga is union of the living with the supreme soul."

[1] Vinishpanna-samádhi ¶ is the expression of the text, which can scarcely be regarded as an appellative. The commentator terms the adept Brahma-jnánin, "he who knows Brahma."

---

* स वै योगी मुमुक्षुरभिधीयते।

† परब्रह्मोपलब्धिमान्।

‡ See Vol. IV., p. 253, note *.

§ Corrected from "Yajnyawalkya". With reference to Yájnavalkya, *vide infra*, p. 230, note ||.

|| By Ratnagarbha.

¶ *Samádhi* is rendered "abstraction", in Vol. II., p. 315.

former be unvitiated by any obstructing imperfection, he will obtain freedom,* after practising devotion through several lives.[1] The latter speedily obtains liberation in that existence (in which he reaches perfection), all his acts being consumed by the fire of contemplative devotion. The sage who would bring his mind into a fit state for (the performance of) devout contemplation must be devoid of desire,† and observe (invariably,) continence, compassion, truth, honesty, and disinterestedness:‡ he must fix his mind intently on the supreme Brahma, practising holy study,§ purification, contentment, penance, and self-control.|| These

---

[1] After three lives, according to the Váyu Saṁhitá, as quoted in the comment.¶

---

* *Mukti.*

† *Nishkáma.*

‡ Compare Vol. III., p. 77, note 1; also, Vol. IV., p. 294, notes 1 and ‡. *Ahiṁsá*, *asteya*, and *aparigraha* I should render 'not killing', 'not thieving', and 'not coveting', rather than "compassion", "honesty", and "disinterestedness".

§ *Swádhyáya*, "the murmuring of sacred texts." In the *Rája-márttaṅḍa* we find the following definition, in explanation of the *Yoga-śástra*, II., 1: स्वाध्यायः। प्रणवपूर्वाणां मन्त्राणां जपः। The *Sútrártha-chandriká* has: स्वाध्यायः। ओंकारपूर्वकमन्त्राणां जपः।

|| स्वाध्यायशौचसंतोषतपांसि नियतात्मवान्।
कुर्वीत ब्रह्मणि तथा परस्मिन्प्रवणं मनः॥

The Translator should not have rendered नियतात्मवान् as if it denoted "self-control". The fifth observance is प्रवणं मनः,—the Translator's "mind intently",—which is equivalent, the scholiasts say, to *praṅidhána*, 'persevering devotion.' See the *Yoga-śástra*, II., 32.

¶ By Ratnagarbha, as follows:

अल्पाभ्यासोऽपि यो मर्त्यः सोऽपि जन्मत्रयात्परम्।
न योनियन्त्रपीडायै पुनरेति न संशयः॥

(virtues), respectively termed the five acts of restraint* (Yama), and five of obligation† (Niyama), bestow excellent rewards, when practised for the sake of reward, and eternal liberation, when they are not prompted by desire (of transient benefits).‡ Endowed with these merits, the sage,§ self-restrained, should sit in one of the modes termed Bhadrásana, &c., and engage in contemplation.[1] Bringing his vital airs, called Práńa, under subjection, by frequent repetition, is, thence, called Práńáyáma, which is, as it were, a seed with a seed.[2] In this, the breath of expiration

---

[1] There are various postures in which the Yogin is directed to sit, when he engages in meditation. In the Bhadrásana,|| he is directed to cross his legs underneath him, and to lay hold of his feet, on each side, with his hands.

[2] सबीजो बीज एव च।¶ It is, itself, figuratively, the seed of the fruit, which is meditation; but it is to be accompanied with what is also technically called Bíja (or seed),—inaudible repe-

---

* 'Forbearance' is more exact. † 'Religious observance' is preferable.

‡ विशिष्टफलदाः काम्या निष्कामानां विमुक्तिदाः।

§ *Yati.*

|| The commentators cite, in description of this posture, a stanza from Yájnavalkya. Perhaps it is taken from the *Yájnavalkya-gítá*, for which see my *Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems*, p. 14.

Besides the *bhadrásana*, the Yoga philosophy prescribes postures denominated *padmásana*, *swastikásana*, *vajrásana*, and *vírásana*. These seem to be the principal out of an aggregate said to consist of eighty-four, among which are the *siddhásana*, *kamalásana*, *dańdásana*, &c.

¶ Correctly, सबीजोऽबीज एव च, "with a seed, and also without a seed." The term 'seed' is here, of course, a technicality.

Samádhi, as *sabíja* and as *nirbíja*, is spoken of in the *Yoga-śástra*, I., 46 and 50. The abstract meditation referred to is, in other words, divided into that in which there is distinct recognition of an object, and that in which there is not such recognition.

See, further, note ‡ in the following page.

and that of inspiration* are alternately obstructed, constituting the act twofold; and the suppression† of both (modes of breathing) produces a third.[1] The exercise of the Yogin, whilst endeavouring to bring before his thoughts the gross form of the eternal, is denominated Álambana.[2]‡ He is then to perform the

---

tition of certain prayers, and meditation on the visible form of the deity,—termed, likewise, Álambana, and presently mentioned.§

[1] Práńáyáma is performed by three modifications of breathing. The first act is expiration, which is performed through the right nostril, whilst the left is closed with the fingers of the right hand: this is called Rechaka. The thumb is then placed upon the right nostril, and the fingers raised from the left, through which breath is inhaled: this is called Púraka. In the third act, both nostrils are closed, and breathing suspended: this is Kumbhaka. And a succession of these operations is the practice of Práńáyáma. ||

[2] Álambana is the silent repetition of prayer. ¶

---

* *Práńa* and *apána*. † *Saḿyama*.

‡ तस्य चालम्बनवतः स्थूलं रूपं द्विजोत्तम ।
आलम्बनमनन्तस्य योगिनोऽभ्यसतः स्मृतम् ॥

"And, as regards the Yogin practising *meditation* with a rest *for his thoughts, as he feels after the Supreme*, the gross aspect of the Infinite—*i. e.*, *Hirańyagarbha*, *etc.*,—is prescribed as the rest, O best of Bráhmans."

See the beginning of annotation ¶ in the preceding page. On the words there quoted Ratnagarbha says: सबीजः । सालम्बनः । मन्त्रजपध्यानसहितः । And Śrídhara writes to the same effect. It is now evident how the Translator came to misunderstand the sense of *bíja* and *álambana*. The commentators begin their gloss on the stanza cited above with the words: तत्र सबीजस्यालम्बनमाह ।

§ This view of the meaning of *bíja* and *álambana* is quite a misapprehension. See the preceding note.

|| Both Śrídhara and Ratnagarbha have the substance of this note.

The Translator has previously rendered *práńáyáma* by "suppression of breath," "austerity", and "ascetic practices". See Vol. II., pp. 89 and 272; Vol. III., p. 55. Its exact meaning is 'regulation of the breath'.

The third division of the *práńáyáma*, the *kumbhaka*, has its name from *kumbha*, 'a jar'; inasmuch as, on its taking place, the vital airs are stationary, like water in a jar. ¶ See note ‡, above.

Pratyáhára, which consists in restraining his organs of sense* from susceptibility to outward impressions, and directing them entirely to mental perceptions. By these means the entire subjugation of the unsteady senses is effected; and, if they are not controlled, the sage will not accomplish his devotions. When, by the Práńáyáma, the vital airs are restrained, and the senses are subjugated by the Pratyáhára, then the sage will be able to keep his mind steady in its perfect asylum."†

Kháńdikya then said (to Keśidhwaja): "Illustrious sage, inform me what is that perfect asylum of the mind,‡ resting on which, it destroys all the products of (human) infirmity." To this, Keśidhwaja replied: "The asylum of mind is spirit (Brahma), which, of its own nature, is twofold, as being with, or without, form; and each of these is supreme and secondary.[1]

---

[1] आश्रयश्चेतसो ब्रह्म द्विधा तच्च स्वरूपतः§ ।
भूप मूर्त्तममूर्त्तं|| च परं चापरमेव च ॥

The Brahma that is without form (Amúrtta) may be Para or Apara. Supreme formless spirit is without attributes of any kind. Secondary formless spirit is invested with the attributes of power, glory, truth, perfection. Spirit embodied, or with form in his highest state, is, according to our text, Vishńu and his manifestations. Spirit, in an inferior or secondary series of bodily forms, is Brahmá and all other living beings.¶

---

* *Aksha.*

† ततः कुर्यात्स्थिरं चेतः शुभाश्रये ।

‡ *Chetas*, as above; and so below.

§ The ordinary reading is स्वभावतः ।

|| Variant: भूतमूर्त्तममूर्त्तम् ।

¶ This note is gleaned, with additions and variations, from the commentaries.

Apprehension of spirit,[1] again, is threefold. I will explain the different kinds to you. They are: that which is called Brahma, that which is named from works, and that which comprehends both. That (mental apprehension) which consists of Brahma is one; that which is formed of works is another; and that which comprehends both is the third: so that mental apprehension* (of the object or asylum of the thoughts) is threefold. Sanandana and other (perfect sages) were endowed with apprehension of the nature† of Brahma. The gods and others, whether animate or inanimate, are possessed of that which regards acts.‡ The apprehension that comprehends both works and spirit exists in Hiraṅyagarbha§ and others, who are possessed of contemplative knowledge, of their own nature, and who, also, exercise certain active functions, as creation and the rest.|| Until all acts, which are

---

[1] The term is Bhávaná, defined to be "function to be engendered by knowledge," ज्ञानजन्यः संस्कारः¶, the mental impression or apprehension following upon knowledge. Here it implies, in particular, the formation of a fixed idea, by the Yogin, of the object of his contemplations. It is also termed Bháva-bhávaná, "apprehension of the being, the existence, or substantiality, of the object; the thing contemplated:" भावभावना। भावो वस्तु तद्विषया भावना।**

---

* भावभावना।

† Here, "apprehension," &c. is to render भावभावना।

‡ कर्मभावना।

§ A name of Brahmá.

|| हिरण्यगर्भादिषु च ब्रह्मकर्मात्मिका द्विधा।
बोधाधिकारयुक्तेषु विद्यते भावभावना॥

¶ Ratnagarbha.

** Śrídhara.

the causes of notions of individuality, are discontinued, spirit is one thing, and the universe is another, to those who contemplate objects as distinct and various.* But that is called true knowledge, or knowledge of Brahma, which recognizes no distinctions, which contemplates only simple existence, which is undefinable by words, and is to be discovered solely in one's own spirit.† That is the supreme, unborn, imperishable form of Vishńu, who is without (sensible) form, and is characterized as a condition of the supreme soul, which is variously modified from the condition of universal form.‡ But this (condition) cannot be contemplated by sages in their (early) devotions;§ and they must, therefore, direct their minds to the gross form of Hari, which is of universal perceptibility.|| They must meditate upon him as Hirańyagarbha, as the glorious¶ Vásava, as Prajápati, as the winds,** the Vasus, the Rudras, the suns, stars, planets, Gandharvas, Yakshas, Daityas, all the gods and their progenitors,†† men, animals,‡‡ mountains, oceans, rivers, trees, all beings, and all sources of beings, all modifications whatever

---

* अक्षीणेषु समस्तेषु विशेषज्ञानकर्मसु ।
विश्वमेतत्परं चान्यद्भेदभिन्नदृशां नृप ॥

† प्रत्यस्तमितभेदं यत्सत्तामात्रमगोचरम् ।
वचसामात्मसंवेद्यं तज्ज्ञानं ब्रह्मसंज्ञितम् ॥

‡ विश्वस्वरूपवैरूप्यलक्षणं परमात्मनः ।

§ This expansion is to represent *yoga-yuj*, for which see p. 228, *supra*.

|| *Viśwa-gochara.*

¶ *Bhagavat.*

** *Marut.*

†† सकला देवयोनयः ।

‡‡ *Paśu.*

of nature and its products,* whether sentient or unconscious, one-footed, two-footed, or many-footed.† All these are the sensible‡ form of Hari, to be apprehended by the three kinds of apprehension. All this universal world, this (world) of moving and stationary beings, is pervaded by the energy of Vishńu, who is of the nature of the supreme Brahma. This energy is either supreme, or, when it is that of conscious embodied spirit,§ it is secondary. Ignorance, or that which is denominated from works, is a third energy,[1] by which the omnipresent energy of embodied spirit is ever excited, and whence it suffers all the pains of repeated worldly existence. Obscured by that (energy of ignorance or illusion), the energy that is denominated from embodied spirit is characterized by different degrees of perfection, in all created beings. In things without life,|| it exists in a very small degree;

---

[1] The term used, throughout, is Śakti (शक्ति), 'power,' 'ability,' 'energy.' By the first kind, or Pará, is understood knowledge able to appreciate abstract truth, or the nature of universal soul; by the second, ability to understand the nature of embodied soul; and, by the third, inability to discern one's own nature, and reliance on moral or ceremonial merit. These different kinds are called energies, because they are the energies or faculties of the Supreme Spirit, or, according to the Vaishńavas, of Vishńu, accompanying soul in all its various conditions of existence.

---

* प्रधानादिविशेषान्तम् ।

† Add "or footless": अपादकम् ।

‡ *Múrtta.*

§ क्षेत्रज्ञाख्या ।

|| As stones and the like, Ratnagarbha says.

it is more, in things that (have life, but) are without motion;* in insects,† it is still more abundant; and still more, in birds; it is more in wild animals;‡ and, in domestic animals, § the faculty is still greater. Men have more of this (spiritual) faculty than animals; and thence arises their authority over them:|| the faculty exists, in an ascending degree, in Nágas, Gandharvas, Yakshas, gods, Śakra, Prajápati, and Hirańyagarbha, and is, above all, predominant in that male (Vishńu) of whom all these various creatures are but the diversified forms, penetrated universally by his energy,—as all-pervading as the ether.¶

"The second[1] state of him who is called Vishńu, and which is to be meditated upon by the (advanced) sage, is that (imperceptible,) shapeless** form of Brahma, which is called, by the wise 'That which is,'[2] and in which all the before-described energies reside. Thence proceeds the form of the universal form, the other great form of Hari, which is the origin of

---

[1] The first, which has been intended to be described in the foregoing passages, was the universal, visible form of Vishńu; the second is his formless or imperceptible condition.

[2] Sat (सत्), "what is being."

---

* *Sthávara.* Ratnagarbha explains that trees, &c. are intended.

† *Sarisŕipa,* which the Translator generally renders "reptiles". *Vide supra,* p. 59, note ††; and p. 94, note ††.

‡ *Mŕiga.*

§ *Paśu.*

|| पशुभ्यो मनुजाश्चातिशक्त्या पुंसः प्रभाविताः ।

¶ एतान्यशेषरूपाणि तस्य रूपाणि पार्थिव ।
यतस्तच्छक्तियोगेन युक्तानि नभसा यथा ॥

** *Amúrtta.*

those manifested forms (or incarnations) that are endowed with every kind of energy, and which, whether the forms of gods, animals, or men, are assumed by him (Hari,) in his sport. This active interposition of the undefinable god, all-comprehending and irresistible, is for the purpose of benefiting the world, and is not the necessary consequence of works.* This form of the universal form is to be meditated upon by the sage,† for the object of purification; as it destroys all sin. In the same manner as fire, (blazing) in the wind, burns dry grass,‡ so Vishńu, seated in the heart, consumes the sins of the sage: and, therefore, let him (resolutely) effect the fixation of his mind upon that receptacle of all the (three) energies, (Vishńu); for that is (the operation of the mind which is called) perfect Dháraná:[1] and, thus, the perfect asylum § of individual, as well as universal, spirit, that which is beyond the three modes of apprehension,|| is attained, for the (eternal) emancipation of the sage. The minds of other beings, which are not fixed upon that asylum, are altogether impure, and are all the gods and the rest, who spring from acts.¶ The retention or apprehen-

[1] Retention, or holding of the image or idea formed in the mind by contemplation: from Dhŕi (धृ), 'to hold,' literally or figuratively.

* These two sentences are a very free rendering.

† Read 'the novice'; the original being *yoja-yuj*. *Vide supra*, p. 228.

‡ *Kaksha*, 'dry wood.'

§ शुभाश्रयः। || भावभावना।

¶ अन्ये तु पुरुषव्याघ्र चेतसो ये व्यपाश्रयाः।
अशुद्धास्ते समस्तास्तु देवाद्याः कर्मयोनयः॥

sion, by the mind, of that visible form of Vishńu, without regard to subsidiary forms, is, thence, called Dháraná;* and I will describe to you the perceptible† form of Hari, which no mental retention will manifest, except in a mind that is fit to become the receptacle of the idea.[1]‡ The meditating sage must think (he beholds internally the figure) of Vishńu, as having a pleased and lovely countenance, with eyes like the leaf of the lotos, smooth cheeks,§ and a broad and brilliant forehead; ears of equal size, the lobes of which are decorated with splendid pendants; a painted neck;|| and a broad breast, on which shines the Śrívatsa¶ mark; a belly falling in graceful folds, with a deep-seated navel;** eight long arms, or else four; and firm and well-knit thighs and legs, with well-formed feet and toes. Let him, with well-governed thoughts, con-

---

[1] The explanation of Dháraná given in the text is rendered unnecessarily perplexed by the double doctrine here taught, and the attempt to combine the abstractions of Yoga theism with the sectarian worship of Vishńu.

---

* मूर्त्तं भगवतो रूपं सर्वापाश्रयनिस्पृहम् ।
एषा वै धारणा ज्ञेया यच्चित्तं तत्र धारयेत् ॥

In *dháraná*, or 'fixed attention', no mediate rest is required, such as is spoken of in note ‡ to p. 231, *supra.*

† *Múrtta.*

‡ तत्र मूर्त्तं हरे रूपं यादृक्चिन्त्यं नराधिप ।
तच्छ्रूयतामनाधारे धारणा नोपपद्यते ॥

§ *Su-kapola.*

|| ? The original has कम्बुग्रीवम् । Śrídhara and Ratnagarbha say: रेखात्रयाङ्कितकण्ठम् ।

¶ See p. 5, and p. 124, note ¶, *supra.*

** वलीत्रिभङ्गिना मग्ननाभिना चोदरेण वै ।

template, as long as he can persevere in unremitting attention, Hari,* as clad in a yellow robe, wearing a (rich) diadem (on his head), and brilliant armlets and bracelets† (on his arms), and bearing (in his hands) the bow, the shell, the mace, the sword, the discus, the rosary,‡ the lotos, and the arrow.[1]§ When this image never departs from his mind, whether he be going, or standing, or be engaged in any other voluntary act, then he may believe his retention to be perfect. The sage|| may then meditate upon the form of Vishńu¶ without (his arms,—as) the shell, mace, discus, and bow,—and as placid, and bearing (only) his rosary.** When the idea of this image is firmly retained, then†† he may meditate on Vishńu without his diadem, bracelets,‡‡ or other ornaments. He may, next, contemplate him as having but one single limb, and may then fix his whole thoughts§§ upon the body to which the limbs belong. This process of forming a lively image in the mind, exclusive of all other objects, constitutes

---

[1] The two last implements are from the comment: the text specifies only six.

---

* चिन्तयेत्तन्मना योगी समाधायात्ममानसम् ।
तावद्यावद्दृढीभूत्वा तत्रैव नृप धारणा ॥

† *Keyúra* and *kaťaka*.

‡ *Aksha-valaya*.

§ *Vide supra*, pp. 124 and 149.

|| *Budha*.

¶ Bhagavat, in the original.

** *Aksha-sútraka*.

†† सा यदा धारणा तद्वदवस्थानवती ततः ।

‡‡ *Keyúra*.

§§ प्रणिधानपरो भवेत् ।

Dhyána (or meditation), which is perfected by six stages;[1] and, when an accurate knowledge of self, free from all distinction, is attained by this mental meditation, that is termed Samádhi.[2] *

---

[1] They are: † 1. Yama, &c., acts of restraint and obligation; ‡ 2. Ásana, sitting in particular postures; § 3. Práńáyáma, modes of breathing; || 4. Pratyáhára, exclusion of all external ideas; ¶ 5. Bhávaná, apprehension of internal ideas; ** 6. Dháraná, fixation or retention of those ideas. ††

[2] The result of the Dhyána or Samádhi ‡‡ is the absence of all idea of individuality, when the meditator, the meditation, and the thing or object meditated upon are, all, considered to be but one. According to the text of Patanjali: "Restraint of the body, retention of the mind, and meditation, which, thence, is exclusively confined to one object, is Dhyána. The idea of identification with the object of such meditation, so as if devoid of individual nature, is Samádhi:' देहबन्धश्चित्तधारणा तत्प्रत्ययैकतानता ध्यानम् । तदैकार्थमात्रनिर्भासं स्वरूपशून्यमिव समाधिः । §§

---

* तद्रूपप्रत्ययये चैका संततिश्चान्यनिस्पृहा ।
तद्ध्यानं प्रथमैरङ्गैः षड्भिर्निष्पाद्यते नृप ॥
तस्यैव कल्पनाहीनं स्वरूपग्रहणं हि यत् ।
मनसा ध्याननिष्पाद्यं समाधिः सोऽभिधीयते ॥

† I do not know whence this classification is taken; and I doubt its correctness exceedingly. According to the *Yoga-śástra*, II., 29, the six stages preceding *dhyána* are *yama*, *niyama*, *ásana*, *práńáyáma*, *pratyáhára*, and *dháraná*. *Yama* and *niyama* can scarcely, from their very nature, be taken as parts of a whole; and *bhávaná* is not at all a stage subservient to the attainment of *yoga*.

‡ *Vide supra*, p. 230, notes * and †.

§ *Ibid.*, note ||.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 231, note ||.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

** *Ibid.*, p. 233, note 1.

†† *Ibid.*, p. 238, note *.

‡‡ These, 'contemplation' and 'meditation', are never to be considered as synonyms. See note †, above.

§§ Here we have an extract from the *Yoga-śástra*,—III., 1—3. These

"(When the Yogin has accomplished this stage, he acquires) discriminative knowledge, which is the means of enabling living soul, when all the three kinds of apprehension are destroyed, to attain the attainable supreme Brahma.[1]* Embodied spirit is the user of the instrument, which instrument is true knowledge; and, by it, that (identification) of the former (with Brahma) is attained.[2] Liberation, which is the object to be effected, being accomplished, discriminative knowledge ceases. When endowed with the apprehension of the nature of the object of inquiry,† then

---

[1] The expressions of the text are somewhat obscure; nor does the commentator‡ make them much more intelligible, until he cuts the matter short, by stating the meaning to be, that "discriminative knowledge enables the living spirit to attain Brahma:" विज्ञानं जीवात्मानं ब्रह्म प्रापयतीत्यर्थः।

[2] The text is very elliptical and obscure. Having stated that embodied spirit (Kshetrajna) is the Karańin, the possessor or user of the Karańa, which is knowledge, it adds तेन तस्य तत्, literally, "by that, of that, that;" i. e., Tat, "that which is;" and Brahma, or supreme spirit, is the attainment of that spirit which abides in body by that instrument, or discriminative knowledge, of which it has become possessed through perfect meditation:

क्षेत्रज्ञः करणी ज्ञानं करणं तेन तस्य तत्।
निष्पाद्य मुक्तिकार्यं वै कृतकृत्यान्निवर्तते॥

विज्ञानं निवर्तते।

---

aphorisms are read as follows: देशबन्धश्चित्तस्य धारणा। तत्र प्रत्ययैकतानता ध्यानम्। तदेवार्थमात्रनिर्भासं स्वरूपशून्यमिव समाधिः। Thus we have definitions of *dháraná*, *dhyána*, and *samádhi*.

* विज्ञानं प्रापकं प्राप्ये परब्रह्मणि पार्थिव।
प्रापणीयस्तथैवात्मा प्रक्षीणाशेषभावनः॥

† तद्भावभावना।

‡ Ratnagarbha.

there is no difference between it (individual,) and supreme spirit:* difference is the consequence of the absence of (true) knowledge. When that ignorance which is the cause of the difference between individual and universal spirit† is destroyed, finally and for ever, who shall (ever) make that distinction (between them) which does not exist? Thus have I, Kháńđikya, in reply to your question, explained to you what is meant by contemplative devotion, both fully and summarily. What else do you wish to hear?"

Kháńđikya replied (to Keśidhwaja, and said): "The explanation which you have given me of the real nature of contemplative devotion has fulfilled all my wishes, and removed all impurity from my mind. The expression 'mine', which I have been accustomed to use, is untruth,‡ and cannot be otherwise declared by those who know what is to be known. The words 'I' and 'mine' constitute ignorance; but practice is influenced by ignorance. Supreme truth § cannot be defined; for it is not to be explained by words. Depart, therefore, Keśidhwaja. You have done all that is necessary for my (real) happiness,|| in teaching me contemplative devotion,—the inexhaustible bestower of liberation from existence."¶

Accordingly, King Keśidhwaja, after receiving suitable homage from Kháńđikya, returned to his city.

---

* Five kinds of emancipation are enumerated in the *Bhágavata-puráńa*, III., XXIX., 13: *sálokya*, *sárshťi*, *sámípya*, *sárúpya*, and *ekatwa*.

† The original words are *átman* and Brahma.

‡ *Asat.*

§ *Paramártha.*

|| *Śreyas.*

¶ *Vimukti.* *Vide supra*, p. 61, note §.

Kháńđikya, having nominated his son Raja,[1] retired to the woods, to accomplish his devotions; his whole mind being intent upon Govinda. There, his entire thoughts being engrossed upon one only object, and being purified by practices of restraint, self-control, and the rest,* he obtained absorption into the pure and perfect spirit† which is termed Vishńu. Keśidhwaja, also, in order to (attain) liberation, became averse from his own perishable works, and lived amidst objects of sense (without regarding them), and instituted religious rites without expecting therefrom any advantages to himself.‡ Thus, by pure and auspicious fruition, being cleansed from (all) sin, he, also, obtained that perfection which assuages all affliction for ever.

---

[1] The commentator, in order to explain how Kháńdikya should have given what he did not possess, states that it is to be understood that Keśidhwaja relinquished to him the kingdom. Or the term Raja may denote merely "master of, or acquainted with, mystic prayers, or Mantras:" यद्वा राजानं मन्त्रादिस्वामिनं कृत्वा।

---

* यमादिगुणशोधितः।

† This is to render Brahma.

‡ केशिध्वजोऽपि मुक्त्यर्थं स्वकर्मक्षपणोन्मुखः।
बुभुजे विषयान्कर्म चक्रे चानभिसंहितम्॥

CHAPTER VIII.

Conclusion of the dialogue between Parásara and Maitreya. Recapitulation of the contents of the Vishńu Puráńa: merit of hearing it: how handed down. Praises of Vishńu. Concluding prayer.

I HAVE now explained to you, Maitreya, the third kind of worldly dissolution, or that which is absolute and final, which is liberation and resolution into eternal spirit.[1] I have related to you primary and secondary creation, the families (of the patriarchs), the (periods of the) Manwantaras, and the genealogical histories* (of the kings). I have repeated to you, (in short,) who were desirous of hearing it, the imperishable Vaishńava Puráńa, which is destructive of all sins, the most excellent of all holy writings, and the means of attaining the great end of man. If there is anything else you wish to hear, propose your question, and I will answer it.

MAITREYA.—Holy teacher,† you have, indeed, related to me all that I wished to know; and I have listened to it with pious attention.‡ I have nothing further to inquire. The doubts inseparable from the

---

[1] The term is Layo Brahmańi (लयो ब्रह्मणि), which means 'a melting away,' 'a dissolution', or 'fusion;' from the root Lí (ली), 'to liquefy,' 'to melt,' 'to dissolve.'

---

* *Vaḿśánucharita.*
† *Bhagavat.*
‡ *Bhakti.*

mind of man have, all, been resolved by you;* and, through your instructions, I am acquainted with the origin, duration, and end† of all things; with Vishńu, in his collective fourfold form;[1] his three energies;[2] and with the three modes of apprehending the object of contemplation.[3]‡ Of all this have I acquired a knowledge, through your favour; and nothing else is worthy to be known, when it is once understood that Vishńu and this world are not (mutually) distinct. Great Muni, I have obtained, through your kindness, all I desired,—the dissipation of my doubts;§ since you have instructed me in the duties of the several tribes, and in other obligations; the nature of active life, and discontinuance of action; and the derivation of all that exists from works.|| There is nothing else, venerable Brahman, that I have to inquire of you. And forgive me, if your answers to my questions have imposed upon you any fatigue. Pardon me the trouble

---

[1] Or with Vishńu in the four modifications described in the First Book,¶—spirit, matter, form, and time. See Vol. I., pp. 18, 19.

[2] Or Śakti, noticed in the last Chapter;—p. 235, *supra*.

[3] Or Bhávanás, also described in the preceding Chapter;¶—p. 233, *supra*.

---

* विच्छिन्नाः सर्वसंदेहा वैमल्यं मनसः कृतम् ।

† *Saḿyama*. See Vol. I., p. 26, note *.

‡ ज्ञातश्चतुर्विधो राशिः शक्तिश्च त्रिविधा गुरो ।
विज्ञाता चापि कार्त्स्न्येन त्रिविधा भावभावना ॥

§ *Apasandeha*.

|| वर्णधर्मादयो धर्मा विदिता यदशेषतः ।
प्रवृत्तं च निवृत्तं च ज्ञातं कर्म मयाखिलम् ॥

¶ Substituted for "section".

that I have given you, through that amiable quality of the virtuous which makes no distinction between a disciple and a child.*

Paráśara.—I have related to you this Puráńa, which is equal to the Vedas (in sanctity), and by hearing which, all faults and sins whatever are expiated. In this have been described to you the primary and secondary creation, the families (of the patriarchs), the Manwantaras, the regal dynasties;† the gods, Daityas, Gandharvas, serpents,‡ Rákshasas, Yakshas, Vidyádharas, Siddhas, and heavenly nymphs;§ Munis endowed with spiritual wisdom, and practisers of devotion;|| the (distinctions of the) four castes, and the actions of the most eminent amongst men;¶ holy places on the earth, holy rivers and oceans, sacred mountains, and legends** of the (truly) wise; the duties of the different tribes, and the observances enjoined by the Vedas.†† By hearing this, all sins are, at once, obliterated. In this, also, the glorious‡‡ Hari has been revealed,—the cause of the creation, preservation, and destruction of the world; the soul of all things, and, himself, all things;§§ by the repetition of whose name man

---

* यदस्य कथनायासैर्योजितोऽसि मया गुरो ।
तत्क्षम्यतां विशेषोऽस्ति न सतां पुत्रशिष्ययोः ॥

† *Vaṁśánucharita.*

‡ *Uraga.*

§ *Apsaras.*

|| मुनयो भावितात्मानः कथ्यन्ते तपसान्विताः ।

¶ पुंसां विशिष्टचरिता नराः ।

** *Charita.*

†† वर्णधर्मादयो धर्मा वेदधर्माश्च कृत्स्नशः ।

‡‡ *Bhagavat.*

§§ *Sarva-bhúta.*

is, undoubtedly, liberated from all sins, which fly like wolves that are frightened by a lion. The repetition of his name with devout faith* is the best remover of all sins; destroying them, as fire purifies the metal (from the dross). The stain of the Kali age, which ensures to men sharp punishments in hell, is, at once, effaced by a single invocation of Hari.† He who is all that is—,the whole egg of Brahmá, with Hirańyagarbha, Indra,‡ Rudra, the Ádityas, the Aświns, the winds, the Kiḿnaras, the Vasus, the Sádhyas, Viśwadevas, the (celestial) gods,§ the Yakshas, serpents,|| Rákshasas,¶ the Siddhas, Daityas, Gandharvas, Dánavas, nymphs,** the stars, asterisms, planets, the seven Ŕishis,†† the regents and superintendents of the quarters,‡‡ men, Brahmans, and the rest, animals tame and wild,§§ insects,|||| birds, ghosts and goblins,¶¶ trees, woods, mountains, rivers, oceans, the subterrene regions,***

---

* *Bhakti.*

† कलिकल्मषमत्युग्रं नरकार्तिप्रदं नृणाम् ।
प्रयाति विलयं सद्यः सकृद्यत्रानुसंस्मृते ॥

‡ *Devendra*, in the original.

§ *Sura.*

|| I do not find them named in the Sanskrit.

¶ The original yields Rakshases.

** *Apsaras.*

†† See Vol. II., p. 226.

‡‡ "The quarters and superintendents of the quarters: धिष्ण्यैर्धिष्ण्याधिपतिभिः । The term Dhishńyádhipati is synonymous with Dikpála; for which, see Vol. III., 170, note §.

Śridhara—if I may judge from the single MS. of his commentary which is accessible to me,—has धिष्ण्य°, with reference to the like of which, see Vol. IV., p. 164, note §.

§§ *Paśu* and *mŕiga.*

|||| *Sariśŕipa. Vide supra*, p. 236, note †; also, Vol. I., p. 84, note §.

¶¶ These two terms are to render प्रेताद्यैः ।

*** Corrected from "legions".

the divisions of the earth, and all perceptible objects,—he who is all things, who knoweth all things, who is the form of all things, being without form himself, and of whom whatever is, from (Mount) Meru to an atom, all consists,—he, the glorious Vishńu, the destroyer of (all) sin,—is described in this Puráńa. By hearing this (Puráńa) an equal recompense is obtained to that which is derived from the performance of an Aśwamedha sacrifice, or from fasting at (the holy places) Prayága,* Pushkara,† Kurukshetra,‡ or Arbuda.§ Hearing this (Puráńa) but once is as efficacious as the offering of oblations in a perpetual fire for a year. The man who, with well-governed passions, bathes at Mathurá, on the twelfth day|| of (the month) Jyeshtha,[1] and beholds (the image of) Hari, obtains a great recompense:¶ so does he who, with mind fixed upon Keśava, attentively recites this Pu-

---

[1] This month is also called Jyeshthá-múla,** which the commentator†† explains to mean the month of which the root or cause (Múla) of being so called is the moon's being full in the constellation Jyeshthá. But it may be so termed, perhaps, from the lunar asterism Múla,—which is next to Jyeshthá,—falling, also, within the moon's passage through the same month.

---

* See Vol. III., p. 246, note 2; and Vol. IV., p. 218, note ‡.

† See Vol. I., Preface, p. XXX.; and Vol. II., p. 96.

‡ See Vol. II., p. 133, note 1; and p. 142, note 4.

§ For this mountain, *vide ibid.*, p. 131, note 1, and p. 141, note 2; also, Vol. IV., p. 222, note ‡.

|| Insert "of the light fortnight".

¶ प्राप्नोति परमां गतिम् । This means, that he obtains emancipation.

** See note † in the next page.

†† Both the commentators give the ensuing explanation. See, further, Nílakańtha on the *Mahábhárata*, *Anuśásana-parvan*, *śl.* 4609.

ráńa. The man who bathes in the waters of the Yamuná, on the twelfth lunation* of the light fortnight of the month in which the moon is in the mansion Jyeshťhá,† and who fasts and worships Achyuta in (the city of) Mathurá, receives the reward of an uninterrupted Aśwamedha. Beholding the (degree of) prosperity (enjoyed by others) of eminence, through (the merits of) their descendants, a man's paternal ancestors, his parents, and their parents exclaim:‡ "Whosoever of our descendants, having bathed in the Yamuná,§ and fasted, will worship Govinda in Mathurá, in the light fortnight of Jyeshťha,|| will secure for us eminent exaltation;¶ for we shall be elevated by the merits of our posterity." A man of good extraction will present obsequial cakes to his fortunate (ancestors) in the Yamuná, having worshipped Janárdana in the light fortnight of Jyeshťha.** But the same degree of merit that a man reaps from adoring Janárdana†† at that season, with a devoted heart, and from bathing in the Yamuná, and effecting the liberation of his progenitors by offering to them (on such an occasion,) obsequial cakes, he derives, also, from hearing, with equal devotion, a section of this Puráńa.‡‡ This Pu-

---

* *Vide supra*, p. 109, note †.

† "The month", &c. is to translate *Jyeshťhá-múla*.

‡ The extract is said, by Śrídhara, to be from the *Pitŕi-gitá*. See Vol. III., p. 66, note §; and p. 170, text and note ||.

§ Kálindí, in the original. See Vol. IV., p. 286, note *.

|| The original is *Jyeshťhá-múla*.

¶ *Ŕiddhi*.

** *Jyeshťhá-múla*, in the Sanskrit.

†† The original has Kŕishńa.

‡‡ श्रुत्वाध्यायं तदाप्नोति पुराणस्यास्य भक्तिमान् ।

ráńa is the best of all preservatives for those who are afraid of worldly existence,* a certain alleviation of the sufferings of men,† and remover of all imperfections.

This (Puráńa), originally composed by the Rishi (Náráyańa), was communicated, by Brahmá,‡ to Ribhu;§ he related it to Priyavrata,|| by whom it was imparted to Bháguri.¶ Bháguri recited it to Tamasitra;[1]** and he, to Dadhícha,†† who gave it to Száraswata.‡‡ From the last Bhŕigu§§ received it, who imparted it to Purukutsa;|||| and he taught it to Narmadá. The goddess¶¶ delivered it to Dhŕitaráshtra,***

---

[1] This name is also read Tambamitra.††† One copy has Tava mitráya,‡‡‡ "to thy friend," as if it was an epithet of Dadhícha: but the construction of the verse requires a proper name. "Bháguri gave it to Tambamitra; and he, to Dadhícha:'§§§

भागुरिस्तम्बमित्राय दधीचाय स चोक्तवान् ।

---

* *Saṁsára.*

† Literally, "a cure for men's bad dreams": दुःस्वप्ननाशनं नृणाम् ।

‡ Called, in the original, by his epithet Kamalodbhava,—the same as Abjayoni. See Vol. I., p. 17, note †.

§ See Vol. I., p. 77, note 1; and Vol. II., p. 330.

|| *Ibid.*, pp. 107, *et seq.*

¶ For a Bháguri, see Vol. II., p. 113, note 1.

** This reading I find nowhere. See, further, note †††, below.

†† Correct from "Dadícha". See Vol. I., p. 124; also, Professor Wilson's Translation of the *Ŕigveda*, Vol. I., p. 216, note a, and p. 310, note a.

‡‡ See Vol. I., p. 17.

§§ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

|||| *Ibid.*, p. 17; Vol. III., p. 268, text and note ‡, and p. 283.

¶¶ Literally, Narmadá.

*** See Vol. I., p. 188, note 1; and Vol. II., p. 74.

††† So reads, like, my Ajmere MS., my oldest MS. of all. Ratnagarbha has Tambhamitra; and my Arrah MS. yields Stambamitra.

‡‡‡ This is Śrídhara's lection.

§§§ Corrected from "Dadhíchi".

the Nága king,* and to Apúraṅa,† of the same race,‡ by whom it was repeated to their monarch,§ Vásuki.|| Vásuki communicated it to Vatsa;¶ and he, to Aśwatara, from whom it successively proceeded to Kambala and Elápatra.** When the Muni Vedaśiras descended to Pátála,†† he there received the whole (Puráṅa) from these Nágas,‡‡ and communicated it to Pramati.§§ Pramati consigned it to the wise Játúkarṅa;|||| and he taught it to many other holy persons. Through the blessing of Vasishṫha¶¶, it came to my knowledge; and I have, now, Maitreya, faithfully imparted it to you. You will teach it, at the end of the Kali age, to Śamíka.[1]*** Whoever hears this great mystery, which

[1] A different series of narrators††† has been specified in the First Book,—Vol. I., p. 17.

* The original has only Nága.

† Corrected from "Puraṅa". See Vol. II., p. 288. From note * to *ibid.*, p. 290, it seems that other Puráṅas read Varuṅa and Aruṅa (?).

‡ The original is धृतराष्ट्राय नागायापूरणाय च। Ápúraṅa is not, then, said to be "of the same race". In the passages referred to in the preceding note, he figures as a Grámaṅí or Yaksha.

§ Literally, "to the king of the Nágas", नागराजाय।

|| See Vol. II., p. 74, and p. 86, note 1.

¶ For the Nága called Vatsa, see Vol. II., p. 287, note *.

** For Aśwatara, Kambala, and Elápatra, see Vol. II., p. 74.

†† The original seems to denote that Vedaśiras became master of Pátála:

पातालं समनुप्राप्तस्ततो वेदशिरा मुनिः।

‡‡ By the word तेन, immediately following the mention of Elápatra, it is implied that from him alone the Puráṅa passed to Vedaśiras.

§§ Variant: Pramita.

|||| Some of my best MSS. give Játúkarṅya. For both names, see Vol. III., p. 36, text and note *.

¶¶ Pulastya, according to my Ajmere MS.

*** Variants: Śanika, Sanika, and Śinika. For Śamika, see Vol. I., Preface, p. LV.

††† On which Ratnagarbha remarks: अत्र संप्रदायान्तरभेदः कल्पभेदव्यवस्थितः।

removes the contamination of the Kali, shall be freed from all his sins. He who hears this every day, acquits himself of his daily obligations to ancestors, gods, and men.* The (great and) rarely attainable merit that a man acquires by the gift of a brown cow,† he derives from hearing ten chapters of this (Puráńa).[1] He who hears the entire (Puráńa), contemplating, in his mind, Achyuta,—who is all things, and of whom all things are made; who is the stay of the whole world, the receptacle of spirit; who is knowledge, and that which is to be known; who is without beginning or end, and the benefactor of the gods,‡—obtains, assuredly, the reward that attends the uninterrupted celebration of the Aśwamedha rite.§ He who reads, and retains with faith this (Puráńa), in the beginning, middle, and end of which is described the glorious Achyuta, the lord of the universe in every stage,|| the master of all that is stationary or moveable, composed of spiritual knowledge,¶ acquires such purity as exists not in any world,—the eternal state of perfection,** (which is) Hari. The man who fixes his

---

[1] This seems to be an injudicious interpolation: it is not in all the copies.††

---

* पितृयज्ञमनुष्येभ्यः समस्तामरसंस्तुतिः ।
कृता तेन भवेद्देतद्यः शृणोति दिने दिने ॥

† *Kapilá*. According to Colebrooke, "when applied to a cow, this term signifies one of the colour of lac dye, with black tail and white hoofs." *Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance*, p. 131, note.

‡ *Amara*.

§ *Vájimedha*, in the original.

|| अखिलजगन्मध्यान्तसर्गप्रभुः ।

¶ ब्रह्मज्ञानमयः ।

** एकान्तसिद्धिः ।

†† Śrídhara ignores it; otherwise it seems to be recognized.

mind on Vishńu goes not to hell. He who meditates upon him regards heavenly enjoyment only as an impediment; and he whose mind and soul are penetrated by him thinks little of the world of Brahmá: for, when present in the minds of those whose intellects are free from soil, he confers upon them eternal freedom. What marvel, therefore, is it, that the sins of one who repeats the name of Achyuta should be wiped away? Should not that Hari be heard of whom those devoted to acts worship with sacrifices, continually, as the god of sacrifice;* whom those devoted to meditation† contemplate as primary and secondary, composed of spirit;‡ by obtaining whom, man is not born, nor nourished,§ nor subjected to death; who is all that is, and that is not, (or both cause and effect); who, as the progenitors, receives the libations|| made to them; who, as the gods, accepts the offerings¶ addressed to them; the glorious being who is without beginning or end; whose name is both Swáhá** and Swadhá;[1]** who is the abode of all spiritual power; in whom the limits of finite things cannot be measured; and who, when he enters the ear, destroys all sin?[2]

---

[1] The words or prayers employed in presenting oblations with fire.

[2] The text has:

यस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि सर्वशक्तिनिलये मानानि नो मानिनाम् ।
निष्ठायै प्रभवन्ति हन्ति कलुषं श्रोत्रं स यातो हरिः ॥

Mána commonly means 'pride;' but here it seems most appro-

---

* *Yajneśwara.* † *Yogin.* ‡ *Brahma-maya.*

§ The original has नो वर्धते हीयते नैव ।

|| *Kavya.* ¶ *Havya.*

** See Vol. III., p. 122, note ‡, *ad finem.*

I adore him, that first of gods, Purushottama,* who is without end and without beginning, without growth, without decay,† without death;‡ who is substance that knows not change. I adore that ever inexhaustible spirit,§ who assumed sensible qualities;|| who, though one, became many; who, though pure, became as if impure, by appearing in many and various shapes; who is endowed with (divine) wisdom, and is the author of the preservation of all creatures.¶ I adore him, who is the one conjoined essence and object of both meditative wisdom and active virtue; who is watchful in providing for human enjoyments; who is one with the three qualities; who, without undergoing change, is the cause of the evolution of the world; who exists of his own essence, ever exempt from decay.** I constantly adore him, who is entitled heaven,†† air, fire, water, earth, and ether;‡‡ who is the

---

priately rendered by its radical import, 'measure.' The measures which are for the determination of measurable things are not applicable to Vishńu.

---

* नतोऽस्मि पुरुषोत्तममाद्यमीशम् । † *Parińáma.* ‡ *Apakshaya.*

§ तस्मै नतोऽस्मि पुरुषाय सदाव्ययाय ।
For *avyaya*, see Vol. I., p. 17, note *.

|| अनुगुणभुज् । ¶ सकलतत्त्वविभूतिकर्ता ।

** ज्ञानप्रवृत्तिनियमैकमयाय पुंसः ।
भोगप्रदानपटवे त्रिगुणात्मकाय ॥
अव्याकृताय भवभावनकारणाय ।
वन्दे स्वरूपमभवाय सदाजराय ॥

†† *Vyoman,* the same as *ákáśa,* which is generally rendered 'ether'. See Vol. I., p. 34, note *.

‡‡ The only reading which I find is
व्योमानिलाग्निजलभूरचनामयाय ।
We have had "ether" just above, in the Translator's "heaven"; and

bestower of all the objects which give gratification to the senses; who benefits mankind with the instruments of fruition; who is perceptible, who is subtile, who is imperceptible. May that unborn, eternal Hari, whose form is manifold, and whose essence is composed of both nature and spirit,* bestow upon all mankind that blessed state which knows neither birth nor decay!

---

there is no sixth element.

In the MS. which Professor Wilson used in preference to any or all others, the letters °रच- in this passage look very like ख, for which he probably took them, not noticing the two letters following, making up °रचना-; and *kha* is one of the words for "ether". *Vide supra*, p. 198, text, with notes ‡ and ¶.

* यस्य रूपं प्रकृतिपरात्ममयम् ।

APPENDIX.

[No one among the contemporaries of Professor Wilson is known to have qualified himself more adequately than Colonel Vans Kennedy for discussing the subject of the Puráńas; and it has, therefore, been considered that the following correspondence must, with all its defects, possess, to the readers of these volumes, sufficient interest to justify its republication in this place. The seven letters of which it consists—namely, five entitled *On Professor Wilson's Theory respecting the Puráńas*, the Professor's Reply, and the Colonel's Rejoinder,—originally appeared in the London *Asiatic Journal* for 1840 and 1841, addressed to its editor. F. H.]

Sir: In the learned and ingenious remarks contained in the Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, Professor Wilson remarks that the Puráńas "may be acquitted of subservience to any but sectarial imposture. They were pious* frauds for temporary purposes;"† and that they "are, also, works of evidently different ages, and have been compiled under different circumstances, the precise nature of which we can but imperfectly conjecture from internal evidence, and from what we know of the history of religious opinion in India. It is highly probable that, of the present popular forms of the Hindu religion, none assumed their actual state earlier than the time of Śankara Áchárya, the great Śaiva reformer, who flourished, in all likelihood, in the eighth or ninth century. Of the Vaishńava teachers, Rá-

* Colonel Kennedy omitted this word. † Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.

mánuja dates in the twelfth century; MadhwácHárya, in the thirteenth; and Vallabha, in the sixteenth; and the Puráńas seem to have accompanied, or followed, their innovations; being obviously intended to advocate the doctrines they taught."* He further observes that "a very great portion of the contents of many [of the Puráńas], some portion of the contents of all, is genuine and old. The sectarial interpolation, or embellishment, is always sufficiently palpable to be set aside without injury to the more authentic and primitive material; and the Puráńas, although they belong especially † to that stage of the Hindu religion in which faith in some one divinity was the prevailing principle, are, also, a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas." ‡ And yet Professor Wilson, at the same time, maintains that religious instruction is not one of the five topics which are treated of in a genuine Puráńa, and that its occurrence in the Puráńas now extant is a decisive proof that these are not the same works, in all respects, that were current, under the denomination of Puráńas, in the century prior to Christianity.

These, however, and similar remarks contained in that Preface, seem to be inconsistent and inconclusive; for, if the Puráńas, in their present form, are of so modern a date, and if the ancient Puráńas are no longer extant, by what means can it be ascertained that any portion of the contents of the works now bearing the name of Puráńas is genuine and old?

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.

† Colonel Kennedy—a very heedless quoter,—had "essentially".

‡ Vol. I., Preface, pp. XI., XII.

Professor Wilson rejects, as not belonging to the Puráńas, in the time of Amara Siṁha (B. C. 56), all those parts of the present Puráńas which relate to the rites and observances and to the theology of the Hindus; but it is those parts only which admit of being compared with other Hindu works, and with all that is known of the Hindu religion. It is, also, unquestionable that certain works denominated Puráńas have been immemorially considered, by the Hindus, as sacred books;* and it must be evident that, unless the doctrines of the Hindu religion were inculcated in those works, they could contain nothing which could communicate to them a sacred character. The opinion, therefore, of Professor Wilson, that the genuine Puráńas treated of profane subjects only, is, obviously, incompatible with that profound reverence with which the Puráńas are regarded by all Hindus, even at the present day. The only argument, also, which he has adduced in support of this opinion depends entirely upon the use and meaning of the term *pancha-lakshańa*, as applied to a Puráńa. But the passage in Sanskrit, quoted in the note in page VII., does not admit of the restricted sense which Professor Wilson has given to it; because the first of the five topics[1] there mentioned, or *sarga*, is inadequately expressed† by "primary creation, or cosmogony." This will be at once evident by a reference

[1] The five topics, as explained by Professor Wilson, are: "1. Primary creation, or cosmogony; 2. Secondary creation, or the destruction and renovation of worlds, including chronology; 3. Genealogy of gods and patriarchs; 4. Reigns of the Manus, or periods called Manwantaras; and, 5. History."

* ?? † But see what the Colonel says in p. 299, note 2, *infra*.

to the contents of the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, where, under *sarga*, are enumerated:* Vishńu, the origin, existence, and end of all things; his existence before creation; his first manifestations; description of Pradhána, of Prakŕiti, of the active cause; development of effects, of the mundane egg. For the description of all that precedes the appearance of the mundane egg, which occurs in the *Vishńu* and other Puráńas, is the most abstruse and sacred part of Hindu theology; as it explains the real nature of the Supreme Being, and of those manifestations of his divine essence which lead men to believe in the actual existence of a material world. The first, therefore, of the five topics treated of in a genuine Puráńa, according to Professor Wilson, necessarily includes religious instruction; because the antecedents to creation could not have been described without, at the same time, explaining the distinction between the one sole-existing spirit and those illusive appearances which seem to be composed of matter. The second, also, of those topics is, equally, of a religious nature; for an account of the destruction and renovation of worlds must, necessarily, include a description of the means and agents employed, by the Supreme Being, for those purposes. Under the first two topics, consequently, is comprised a great part of what is contained in the Puráńas, as at present extant: namely, a description of the real essence of the Supreme Being, and of the illusive nature of the universe; of the production of Brahmá, Vishńu, Śiva, and their female energies; of the origin of angelic beings and holy sages; and of all the circumstances relating

* This is not a fair representation.

to the repeated creation, destruction, and renovation of the world; and it may, therefore, be justly concluded, that these subjects were also treated of in the eighteen Puráńas, as originally committed to writing, and that the term *pancha-lakshańa* affords no grounds for the conclusion which Professor Wilson has deduced from its use and meaning.

But those parts of the present Puráńas which relate to festivals, rites, and observances, and to the worship of particular deities, may appear to support this remark of Professor Wilson: "They [the Puráńas] are no longer authorities for Hindu belief, as a whole: they are special guides for separate and, sometimes, conflicting branches of it; compiled for the evident purpose of promoting the preferential, or, in some cases, the sole, worship of Vishńu, or of Śiva."* It is not clear what is here meant by the "Hindu belief, as a whole;" for there are, I believe, no traces, now extant, of the Hindu religion having ever existed as one uniform system of belief in one and the same deity. But the antiquity of the Upanishads is not disputed; and, in one or other of them, the attributes of the Supreme Being are distinctly ascribed to Brahmá, Vishńu, Śiva, Deví, Súrya, and Gańeśa; and, consequently, when the Upanishads were composed, there must have been some Hindus who paid a preferential worship to one or other of those deities. These, however, are precisely the same deities to whom the attributes of the Supreme Being are ascribed in one or other of the Puráńas; and, therefore, if the antiquity

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.

of the Upanishads be admitted, the variety of deities proposed for worship in the Puráńas now extant can be no proof that these works were recently compiled, for sectarian purposes. The Vedas, indeed, have not yet been so examined as to admit of its being determined whether the same distinction is to be found in them; but Mr. Colebrooke has stated that the whole of the Indian theology is founded on the Upanishads, and that several of them, which he has described, were extracts from the Vedas. The six deities, therefore, just mentioned, were, most probably, objects of worship, when the religious system of the Vedas flourished; and it must, in consequence, be altogether improper to consider the worshippers of one of those deities, in preference to the others, as sectarians, if, by this term, is intended such sectarians as have existed in India in later times. For, according to the principles of the Hindu religion, there is unity in diversity; and, hence, it is held that these apparently different deities are merely variant forms of one and the same Supreme Being, and that, consequently, the worship of any one of them is equally holy and effective,—as it is, in fact, the adoration of the Supreme Being in that particular form. Sectarianism, at the same time, consists in the exclusive, and not merely preferential, worship of a particular deity; but in not one of the Puráńas is there a single intimation, or injunction, which, virtually, or expressly, sanctions the rejection of the worship of Vishńu, or Śiva, or of any of the other six deities. The orthodox Hindus, therefore, are, even at the present day, votaries, but not sectaries, of either Vishńu or Śiva; and such they appear to have been from the

remotest time,—as the particular worship of Brahmá has long ceased, and, though particular worshippers of Súrya and Gańeśa have existed, and, perhaps, still exist, in India, they have never been numerous, and the worship of Deví has degenerated into rites and ceremonies which, though practised by many Hindus, are, generally, considered to be contrary to the tenets and ritual of the Hindu religion.[1]

Professor Wilson also has not explained the sectarian purposes to promote which he thinks the works at present bearing the names of Puráńas were compiled in a period so comparatively modern as that between the eighth and seventeenth centuries. But he cannot mean to contend that Vishńu and Śiva were not objects of worship in the earliest times of the Hindu religion, or that they were worshipped with the same rites and ceremonies; and, if not, the mere ascribing, in those works, preeminence to either Vishńu or Śiva, and a superior excellence to the worship of either of those gods,—which is all that occurs of them,—can be no proof that the Puráńas, as now extant, are mere modern works, compiled for sectarian purposes; because in not one of the eighteen Puráńas is it, in any manner, intimated that Vishńu or Śiva ought not to be worshipped; and, on the contrary, numerous passages occur in them, in which precisely the same rewards are promised to the worshipper of either god. So far, indeed, is any one of the Puráńas from inculcating the exclusive worship of either Vishńu or

[1] I here merely allude to the worship of Deví by the sacrifice of animals, and not to the abominable worship described in the Tantras.

Śiva, that Vishńu is introduced, in some of them, teaching the worship of Śiva, and, in others, Śiva, teaching the worship of Vishńu. The only distinction which appears to exist between these gods is, that, in particular Puráńas, each is represented as the Supreme Being, when the other becomes, in a certain sense, inferior, without, however, detracting from his divine excellence. It is, also, remarkable that it is not in separate Puráńas only that preeminence is ascribed to either Vishńu or Śiva, or even to Brahmá; but this ascription occurs in the very same Puráńa. For, as far as I have observed, there are only five Puráńas in which the supremacy is uniformly ascribed to the same god: namely, the *Linga* and *Skanda*, in which Śiva is identified with the Supreme Being; the *Vishńu* and *Bhágavata*, in which this honour is attributed to Vishńu; and the *Brahma Vaivarta*, in which Kŕishńa is represented as the Supreme Being, and his favourite mistress, Rádhá, as his *śakti* or energy. When, therefore, in the Puráńas as now extant, equal reverence is given not only to Vishńu and Śiva, but to four other deities, and when nothing occurs, in them, which in the least sanctions the rejection of the worship of those deities, or in any manner condemns or disparages it, it seems evident that such works could not have been composed for the sectarian purpose of promoting the exclusive worship of either Vishńu or Śiva, or of any other god.[1]

---

[1] I should except the *Brahma Vaivarta Puráńa* (for I have not met with any Upanishad in which Kŕishńa is represented as the Supreme Being); but this Puráńa appears to me to be of

It is, as the same time, impossible to understand why Professor Wilson should have been so anxious to establish, in that Preface, that the Puráńas now extant are mere modern compilations, and that a genuine Puráńa treats of profane subjects only, when, in p. XCVII., he makes these remarks: "That Brahmans unknown to fame have remodelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and, especially, the Puráńas, cannot reasonably be contested, after dispassionately weighing the strong internal evidence, which all of them afford, of the intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients. But the same internal testimony furnishes proof, equally decisive, of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of the Puráńas, in the face of abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era." For the natural conclusion from such premisses must, necessarily, be, that the Puráńas now extant are the very same works which were known, under that denomination, three centuries before the Christian era, but that they, at the same time, afford strong internal testimony of an intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients. But, to invert this conclusion, and to suppose that, because some parts

---

a much more ancient date than that ascribed to it by Professor Wilson.

of the present Puráńas are, perhaps, modern, therefore these works must be modern compilations, is, obviously, contrary to every principle of just reasoning; because, as it is admitted that ancient materials existed anterior to the supposed compilation of the present Puráńas, and as no cause can be assigned for their disappearance—if such existed,—in the tenth or eleventh century, it is most reasonable to conclude that the Puráńas now extant do, actually, consist of those very materials, and that they are, in fact, the very same works which were current, under that denomination, in the time of Amara Siḿha. Professor Wilson, however, seems to have given more weight to the internal testimony arising from those passages of the Puráńas which he thinks have a modern appearance, than to that which results from those parts which the Puráńas must have contained from their first composition, in order to entitle them to a sacred character and to that reverence with which these works have been always regarded by the Hindus. But the fixing the precise date when the Puráńas received their present form is a question of little or no consequence, when it is admitted that there is "abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era."

The Puráńas, therefore, cannot be—as also remarked by Professor Wilson, in p. XI.,—pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarial imposture. But these are the principal grounds on

which he rests his opinion, that the Puráńas now extant did not receive their present form until a thousand years after the birth of Christ. Professor Wilson, however, does not explain in what this imposture consisted, or for what sectarian purpose it was intended. That there are, at this day, and may have been, for many centuries, exclusive worshippers of Vishńu, or Śiva, is undoubted; but, as I have before observed, this exclusive worship is not sanctioned by anything that is contained in the Puráńas now extant; nor do they, in any manner, countenance those more obscure sects which have existed in India in later times. The opinion, also, of Professor Wilson, that "the designation of Śakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole [of the *Rájasa* division of the Puráńas], although it is to some of the series; for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Puráńa,"* is, unquestionably, erroneous; because, in not one of the eighteen Puráńas is there the slightest indication of the Tántrika worship, or the slightest allusion to it; for the worship of Deví, in the form of Durgá or Kálí, by blood, flesh, and spirituous liquors, is essentially different from that of Deví as Śakti: in the one, it is her image which is worshipped, and, in the latter, it is a naked virgin.[1] Had, however, imposture for sectarian purposes been the object for which the Puráńas were written, it must have been evident in every part of them; but, on the

[1] Strictly speaking, not the virgin, but the κτείς of the virgin.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XXI., XXII.

contrary, I have no doubt that, were they carefully and dispassionately examined, it would satisfactorily appear that they contain nothing which is incompatible with those principles of the Hindu religion which are universally acknowledged by all Hindus. The argument, consequently, deduced from the assumption that the Puráńas, as now extant, are pious frauds, and, therefore, modern compilations, is refuted by the whole scope and tendency of those works; nor, were it even proved that interpolations and additions have taken place in them, would this circumstance detract from the authenticity of such portions of them as afford strong internal evidence of their antiquity. But what more conclusive evidence of their antiquity can be required than—as is admitted by Professor Wilson himself,—their containing a correct description of the doctrines, the legends, and the institutions of the Hindu religion which were prevalent in India three centuries before the Christian era? For it is, obviously, much more probable that the present Puráńas are works which were then extant, than that eighteen different persons should, each, have conceived, thirteen hundred years afterwards, the design of writing a Puráńa, and should have been able to compile or compose, so accurately, eighteen different works which correspond so exactly in numerous essential and minute particulars.

The eighteen Puráńas, also, as Professor Wilson states, consist of 400.000 *ślokas*, or 1.600.000 lines; and it must, therefore, be evident that nothing but the most attentive examination of the whole of such extensive works, and a thorough knowledge of the

exact state of India, and of all the changes which may have taken place, in the country and amongst the people, during the last two thousand years, could enable any person to fix, with any degree of certainty, from the internal evidence of the Puráńas, the date when each of them was composed. A name, a circumstance, or even a legend may have a modern appearance; but its recentness, or antiquity, can only be determined by there being some known facts with which it can be compared; and it is the want of such facts, in the present state of our knowledge of Hindu history, that renders all reasoning, with respect to the dates of the events mentioned in the Puráńas, so completely inconclusive. Most of the legends, also, are of a miraculous nature; and no date, therefore, can be inferred from them. Professor Wilson, however, undeterred by such considerations, has not hesitated to fix the time when each Puráńa was composed, and to place the compilation of the Puráńas, as now extant, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries. But his reasons for assigning so modern a period to the compilation of those works appear to rest, principally, if not entirely, on the contents of the different Puráńas not corresponding with his preconceived opinion of what a Puráńa ought to be. For Professor Wilson thus observes, with respect to the *Brahma Vaivarta Puráńa*: "The character of the work is, in truth, so* decidedly sectarial, and the sect to which it belongs, so distinctly marked,—that of the worshippers of the juvenile Kŕishńa and Rádhá, a form of belief of known modern origin,—that it can scarcely have found a notice in a

* Colonel Kennedy omitted the words "in truth, so".

work to which, like the Matsya, a much more remote date seems to belong. Although, therefore, the Matsya may be received in proof of there having been a Brahma Vaivarta Puráńa at the date of its compilation, dedicated especially to the honour of Kŕishńa, yet we cannot credit the possibility of its being the same we now possess."[1] * Thus, Professor Wilson decides, not only that "the Brahma Vaivarta has not the slightest title to be regarded as a Puráńa,"† but, also, that the Puráńa which bore that name is no longer extant; and yet he adduces neither argument nor proof in support of this decision, and of his gratuitous assumption that this Puráńa owes its origin to the modern sect of the worshippers of the juvenile Kŕishńa. He admits, also, that the first three Books (or nearly two-thirds,) of this Puráńa are occupied in the description of the acts of Brahmá, Deví, and Gańeśa; but he does not explain why the supposed sectarian writer, instead of composing a work solely in honour of Kŕishńa, and in support of his sect, has dedicated so great a part of the Puráńa to the celebration of other deities. In the same manner, Professor Wilson remarks, with respect to the *Vámana Puráńa*: "It is of a more tolerant

[1] The object of this Puráńa is to represent Kŕishńa as the Supreme Being, and Rádhá, as his energy; and it is, therefore, altogether improbable that it should have been compiled for the purpose of promoting the modern worship of the juvenile Kŕishńa, or that a modern work should have been written, and substituted in the place of the *Brahma Vaivarta Puráńa* mentioned in the *Matsya*.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. LXVI. † *Ibid.*, p. LXVII.

character than the Puráńas, and divides its homage between Śiva and Vishńu with tolerable impartiality. It is not connected, therefore, with any sectarial principles, and may have preceded their introduction. It has not, however, the air of any antiquity; and its compilation may have amused the leisure of some Brahman of Benares three or four centuries ago."[1]* But this, surely, is not the manner in which the question whether the Puráńas, as now extant, are ancient and original compositions, or mere modern compilations, ought to be discussed,—far less, decided. On the contrary, the particular passages of the Puráńas which are supposed to be modern ought to be adduced, or referred to; and it should, then, be shown that the circumstances and events, or the doctrines and legends, mentioned in them could not be of an ancient date, because they had occurred, or had been introduced, in modern times, or that they were posterior to modern events of known dates; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has not followed this method, but trusted to conjecture and inferences deduced from erroneous premisses, it seems evident that his speculations respecting the modern period in which the present Puráńas were composed must be considered to be either groundless or not yet supported by the requisite proof.

---

[1] As, however, Professor Wilson places the introduction of sectarial principles in the eighth or ninth century,† the date of the *Vámana Puráńa*, if compiled previous to their introduction, must be the eighth century, at least, and not the fourteenth or fifteenth.

---

* Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXVI.

† *Vide supra*, p. 257.

The preceding observations will have, perhaps, evinced that the remarks contained in Professor Wilson's Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa* have been written under the impression of two conflicting opinions: for he is obliged to admit that the Puráńas now extant were compiled from ancient materials, and that they are "a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas"; and yet he contends that those works are pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarial imposture. But both these opinions cannot be correct; and it must, therefore, be most accordant with probability to conclude that, although interpolations and additions may, possibly, have taken place in the Puráńas, as now extant, they are, still, in all essential respects, the very same works which have been, from remote times, held sacred by the Hindus. That, however, alterations have been made in the present Puráńas is a mere supposition, which has never yet been supported by any clear and satisfactory proof; and the inconsistent and inconclusive reasoning, employed by a person so well acquainted with the Puráńas as Professor Wilson, to prove that they are mere modern compilations, must, alone, evince that the internal evidence of the Puráńas, even in their present form, affords such incontrovertible proof of their antiquity, that even those who wish to contest this are obliged to admit it, and to explain it by having recourse to the conjecture, that ancient materials existed, from which those parts of the extant Puráńas which are, most probably, ancient, were compiled. But, as this conjecture is altogether gra-

tuitous, and unsupported by proof, it may be much more reasonably concluded that the Puráńas now extant are the very same works which have been always known, under that denomination, from the remote time when they were originally composed;* and Professor Wilson himself remarks that "they never emanated from any impossible combination of the Brahmans to fabricate for the antiquity of the entire Hindu system any claims which it cannot fully support;"† and that "the origin and development of the doctrines, traditions, and institutions [described in the Puráńas now extant,] were not the work of a day; and the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity carries it back to a much more remote antiquity,—to an antiquity that is, probably, not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions, or beliefs of the ancient world."‡

VANS KENNEDY.

Bombay, 28*th August*, 1840.

SIR: In the letter which I addressed to you on the 28th ult., I confined myself to such observations as seemed to evince that the remarks contained in Professor Wilson's Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa* were written under the impression of two conflicting opinions, which could not, both, be correct. As my attention has, thus, been again directed to the question whether the eighteen Puráńas, as now extant,

* Of this untenable position Colonel Kennedy nowhere offers any proof

† Vol. I., Preface, p. XI. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. XCIX.

V. 18

are ancient compositions, or modern compilations, I am induced to enter into a further discussion of this subject. For it is evident that, if the works now known under that denomination were written between the eleventh and seventeenth centuries, for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarial imposture, they cannot be a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas. Nor can they, indeed, afford any authentic information with respect to the state of the Hindu religion previous to the twelfth century; because, even admitting that those works may have been partly compiled from ancient materials, there are no means now available by which what is genuine and old that may be contained in them can be distinguished from what is supposed to be spurious and modern.

The limits of a preface may have prevented Professor Wilson from fully discussing this question; but, as that Preface extends to seventy-five quarto pages, it is most probable that he has, at least, stated, in it, the principal reasons which induce him to consider the Puráńas to be modern compositions. To me, however, it appears that those reasons, instead of supporting Professor Wilson's opinion, should lead to a directly contrary conclusion. The arguing, in particular, that, because not one of the present Puráńas corresponds with the term *pancha-lakshańa*, or "treatises on five topics",—which is given as a synonym to a Puráńa, in the vocabulary of Amara Simha,—therefore it is decidedly proved "that we have not, at present, the same works, in all respects, that were current, under the denomination of Puráńas, in the century

prior to Christianity,"* is, certainly, altogether inconclusive. For a mere descriptive term cannot be received as proof, when the argument itself admits that the works which it was intended to describe are no longer extant, and that, consequently, there are no means of determining whether the term did, or did not, apply strictly to those works. On the supposition, also, that the Puráńas now extant are modern compositions, written in imitation of the ancient Puráńas, it must be evident that those works could not have been restricted to the treating only of the five topics mentioned by Professor Wilson; for he himself observes that the description of a Puráńa, included in the term *pancha-lakshańa*, is utterly inapplicable to some of the present Puráńas, and that to others it only partially applies. But, though it may be supposed that the Brahmans might possibly recompose their sacred books, it is altogether improbable that they would so alter them, as to leave no resemblance between the original and its substitute; and, consequently, had the prescribed form for the composition of a Puráńa required the treating of five topics only, in that precise form would the present Puráńas (if modern compilations,) have, no doubt, been written. As, therefore, they do not exhibit that form, and as they could not have succeeded to the reverence in which the ancient Puráńas were held, unless they resembled those works, (at least in form,) it is most reasonable to conclude that a Puráńa, as originally composed, was not "a treatise on five topics." The miscellaneous nature, consequently, of the contents of the present Puráńas cannot

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.

be admitted as a valid objection to their antiquity, on a mere supposition, which is not only improbable in itself, but which is, also, disproved by the sacred character that has been immemorially ascribed to the Puráńas, which, it is obvious, they could not have received, had they treated only of the profane topics mentioned by Professor Wilson.

The argument also supposes that the original eighteen Puráńas were current prior to the Christian era; and, before, therefore, the conclusion can be granted, the time and manner in which those works have become extinct should be proved: for, as numerous Sanskrit works which were, unquestionably, extant at the commencement of the Christian era, have been preserved until the present day, nothing but satisfactory proof can establish that the Puráńas alone, although held to be sacred books, have completely disappeared. It requires to be particularly considered that the Puráńas consist of eighteen distinct works, comprising an aggregate of 1.600.000 lines,* and that India, more than one million of square miles in extent, has been, during the last two thousand years, divided into at least ten distinct regions,† differing in language and in local customs and prejudices. Were it, therefore, even conceded that the Brahmans, since the Christian era, had succeeded in suppressing the whole of the eighteen Puráńas, and in substituting other works in their place, in some one or other region of India, still copies of the original Puráńas would have

---

* See Vol. I., Preface, p. XXIV.

† For the particulars of this unscientific classification, see Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. II., p. 179.

been preserved in the other regions. Nothing but the entire extirpation of the Brahmanical religion, throughout the whole of so extensive a country, could have effected the complete destruction of such voluminous works,—the more especially, as their sacred character would have rendered their preservation an object of constant solicitude. But, until a complete suppression of the ancient Puráńas had been effected, other works could not have been substituted in their place; and, thus, the objection to the supposition that the Puráńas, as now extant, were not written until between the eleventh and seventeenth centuries becomes insuperable. For, admitting the dates assigned to each of the Puráńas by Professor Wilson, it may be asked: Was the ancient Puráńa, bearing the same name, extant until it was superseded by the modern one, or was it not? In the first case, in what manner was its supersession accomplished? Professor Wilson extends the period during which he supposes the Puráńas to have received their present form, to eight centuries; and he, thus, admits that the replacing of the ancient Puráńas by new works did not proceed from a combination of the Brahmans to remodel the Hindu religion on new but premeditated principles. It becomes, therefore, impossible to understand how any individual could, without the consent and assistance of the Brahmans, effect the suppression of an ancient Puráńa, and the substitution, in its place, of a work of his own composition or compilation, throughout the whole of India. If, for instance, the *Bhágavata* was written by Bopadeva, at Doulutabad, in the twelfth century, was the original *Bhágavata* then in existence, or not? If it

was, what reason, consistent with probability, can be assigned for supposing that the Brahmans of all India would have suppressed one of their sacred books, to which they ascribed a divine origin, and received, as entitled to the same reverence, the acknowledged composition of an obscure grammarian? The supposition is, evidently, absurd. It is strange, also, that Mr. Colebrooke should have remarked that "Bopadeva, the real author of the *Śrí Bhágavata*, has endeavoured to reconcile all the sects of Hindus, by reviving the doctrines of Vyása. He recognizes all the deities, but as subordinate to the Supreme Being, or, rather, as attributes or manifestations of God:"[1] for, with the omission of the word "attributes", this is precisely the same doctrine which is invariably taught in each and all of the eighteen Puráńas. The *Bhágavata*, therefore, as now extant, could not have been written for the purpose of inculcating a new doctrine; for, in that respect, it entirely corresponds with the other Puráńas: nor is the representation, in it, of Vishńu as the Supreme Being inconsistent with the principles of the Hindu religion as explained in the other Puráńas. It, in consequence, does not afford the slightest internal evidence of its having been written for the purpose of sectarial imposture; nor have I observed, in it, any passage which indicates that this Puráńa could not have been written prior to the twelfth century. If, however, the original *Bhágavata* was not then in

[1] *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. VII., p. 280.*

* Or *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., p. 197.

existence, the objection still remains insuperable; for nothing can render it in the least probable that the Brahmans of all India would receive the composition of an obscure individual as a sacred book entitled to their reverence. It must, also, be evident that, if the Puráńas which were current in the century prior to the Christian era have not been suppressed, there can be no reason for supposing that they have not been preserved until the present day. But it seems unquestionable that the Puráńas then current could not have been subsequently suppressed, and other works substituted in their place, unless the Brahmans of all India had combined together in order to effect that object; and Professor Wilson, himself, remarks that the Puráńas, in their present form, "never emanated from any impossible combination of the Brahmans to fabricate for the antiquity of the entire Hindu system any claims which it cannot fully support."* A combination, therefore, of the Brahmans being considered to be impossible, it must appear most probable that the eighteen Puráńas have been preserved, during the last eighteen hundred years, in the same manner as other Sanskrit works of the same period have been preserved, and that the present Puráńas are, in fact, in all essential respects, the same works which were current, under that name, in India in the century prior to the Christian era.†

Another argument adduced by Professor Wilson, in

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.

† Throughout this critique, Colonel Kennedy seems to ignore the predictive sections of the Puráńas,—a very essential feature in almost all of them.

support of his opinion, is the sectarian tendency of the Puráńas. But he does not clearly explain what he means by that term; and, in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," he has observed: "This is not the case, however, with the first two on the list, the Saurapátas and Gáńapátas: these are usually, indeed, ranked with the preceding divisions, and make, with the Vaishńavas, Śaivas, and Śáktas, the five orthodox divisions of the Hindus."[1] In this passage, however, some inadvertency must have occurred: for, according to Professor Wilson's own account, the Śáktas cannot be included among the orthodox divisions of the Hindus; and I suppose, therefore, that the worshippers of Deví were here intended. But Vishńu, Śiva, Deví, Súrya, and Gańapati are the very deities, and the only ones, whose worship is described or mentioned in the Puráńas; and, as this is admitted to be orthodox, it must follow that the Puráńas could not have been written for sectarian purposes. What are the sects, therefore, to which Professor Wilson alludes, in that Preface, is not apparent. But his notion of a sect would seem to originate in this singular opinion, which he has expressed with respect to the Pauráńik account of the Hindu religion: "The different works known by the name of Puráńas are, evidently, derived from the same religious system as the Rámáyańa and Mahábhárata, or from the mytho-heroic stage of Hindu belief."* For, in both those poems, the passages which

---

[1] *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XVII., p. 230.†

---

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.

† Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 265, 266.

relate to the legends and tenets of the Hindu religion are merely incidental, and do not form a principal part of those works; while, on the contrary, the legends and tenets of the Hindu religion are not only the principal, but the sole, subject of the Puráńas. It is much more probable, therefore, that such incidental notices of those topics as occur in the two poems were derived from the Puráńas, than that such extensive works as the Puráńas—which embrace all the details of Hindu mythology, and all the abstruse doctrine of Hindu theology,—were derived from poems which are, principally, of an historical character. To conclude, consequently, that, because those topics are treated of at much greater length in the Puráńas than in the *Rámáyańa* and *Mahábhárata*, therefore the Puráńas were written at a later period than those poems, is, evidently, erroneous. At the same time, on what grounds does Professor Wilson suppose that there ever was a "mytho-heroic stage of Hindu belief"? He merely says that Ráma and Kŕishńa "appear to have been, originally, real and historical characters," who have been "elevated to the dignity of divinities,"* and that the Puráńas belong, essentially, to that stage of Hindu belief "which grafted hero-worship upon the simpler ritual"† of the Vedas. But Professor Wilson adduces neither argument nor quotation in support of this opinion; and it is, therefore, sufficient to observe that, in the Puráńas, the *Rámáyańa*, and *Mahábhárata*, Ráma and Kŕishńa are invariably described, not as mere men, but as in-

* Vol. I., Preface, p. IV.
† *Ibid.*, p. XII.

carnate forms of Vishńu, and that not a single passage can be produced, from those works, which inculcates hero-worship.

Professor Wilson, however, not only remarks that "Śiva and Vishńu, under one or other form, are almost the sole objects that claim the homage of the Hindus, in the Puráńas,"* but also rests much of his reasoning, with respect to the date when each Puráńa, as at present extant, was composed, and to its having been written for sectarian purposes, on the character of Kŕishńa as a hero-god. For, in describing the *Brahma Puráńa*, he observes: "Then come a number of chapters relating to the holiness of Orissa, with its temples and sacred groves dedicated to the Sun, to Śiva, and Jagannátha,[1]—the latter, especially. These chapters are characteristic of this Puráńa, and show its main object to be the promotion of the worship of Kŕishńa as Jagannátha."[2]† With regard, also, to the *Vishńu Puráńa*, he remarks: "The fifth book of the Vishńu Puráńa is exclusively occupied with the life of Kŕishńa. This is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Puráńa, and is one argument against its antiquity."‡ And this objection he explains, in speaking of the *Brahma Vaivarta Puráńa*, where he observes that the decidedly sectarial

[1] A name of Kŕishńa.

[2] Professor Wilson states, at the same time, that the legend of Jagannátha occupies one-third only of this Puráńa; from which it would be more just to conclude that its main object could not be the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.

† *Ibid.*, p. XXVIII.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. CIX.

character of that Puráńa shows that it belongs to the sect, of known modern origin, which worship the juvenile Kŕishńa and Rádhá.* But Professor Wilson does not specify the forms of Śiva, the worship of which is mentioned in the Puráńas, as he states; and, on the contrary, it is unquestionable that, in those works, it is strictly enjoined that Śiva should be worshipped under no other figure or type than that of the Linga; and, as Śiva was never incarnate, there could be no form under which he could be worshipped. With regard, also, to Vishńu, Professor Wilson confines his remarks to the eighth incarnation only, that of Kŕishńa. But the Puráńas contain long details relating to the incarnation of Vishńu in the human forms of Rámachandra and Paraśuráma; and why, therefore, should Kŕishńa alone be considered as a real historical character who has been elevated to the dignity of divinity? The answer is obvious. There is a sect, of known modern origin, who worship the juvenile Kŕishńa and Rádhá; and it may, in consequence, be concluded that the Puráńas in which Kŕishńa is mentioned were written for the purpose of promoting the extension of that sect. But, as no sect has selected Rámachandra or Paraśuráma as the peculiar object of their worship, no argument could be founded on the mention of their names in the Puráńas; and, therefore, it was unnecessary to notice them. But they were, both, greater heroes than Kŕishńa, and lived several centuries before him;† and, had, consequently, hero-

* Vol. I., Preface, p. LXVI.

† The Colonel is precise, here, beyond all reasonable warrant.

worship ever prevailed in India, it must seem most probable that it would have originated with Rámachandra,—whose expedition to Lanká is the subject of a celebrated and revered poem,—had the Hindus ever considered him to be merely a mortal prince. It is, however, needless to continue these observations; for Professor Wilson has, himself, refuted his own opinion; as he has also remarked that Kŕishńa is not represented in the character of Bála Gopála (the object of worship of the modern sect,) in the *Vishńu* and *Bhágavata Puráńas*,* and that the life of Kŕishńa in the *Brahma Puráńa* "is, word for word, the same as that of the Vishńu Puráńa;"† to which I add, that Kŕishńa is not represented in that character in the *Brahma Vaivarta Puráńa*: for it is in those Puráńas only that the life of Kŕishńa is described at length; and, in them, Kŕishńa invariably appears and acts as a human being, except on occasions when he exerts his divine power; but he is, at the same time, frequently acknowledged and adored as Vishńu in the incarnate form of Kŕishńa.[1]

[1] I do not exactly understand what Professor Wilson means by this remark: "Ráma, although an incarnation of Vishńu, commonly appears [in the *Rámáyańa*,] in his human character alone."‡ I suppose he means, that Ráma is seldom described, in that poem, as exerting his divine power; for he always appears, in it, as a man, even when he acts as a god. Nor can I understand what the notion is which Professor Wilson has formed of a divine incarnation; for he observes that the character of Kŕishńa is very *contradictorily* described in the *Mahábhárata*,—usually,

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XXII. Colonel Kennedy here misrepresents.

† *Ibid.*, p. XXIX.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. XV.

All suppositions, therefore, that hero-worship ever prevailed in India, or that it is inculcated in the Puráńas, or that Vishńu and Śiva have ever been worshipped under any other figure or type than such as exist at the present day, are entirely groundless.

It will hence appear that this remark of Professor Wilson must be erroneous: "The proper appropriation of the third [*Rájasa*,[1]] class of the Puráńas, according to the Padma Puráńa[2] appears to be the worship of Kŕishńa .... as the infant Kŕishńa, Govinda, Bála Gopála, the sojourner in Vŕindávana, the companion of the cowherds and milkmaids, the lover of Rádhá, or as the juvenile master of the universe, Jagannátha."* But, in the same manner as Professor Wilson thus appropriates, on no grounds whatever, one class of the Puráńas to the worship of Kŕishńa, he also appropriates another class, the *Támasa*, to the Tántrika worship. For he remarks: "This last argument is of weight in regard to the particular instance specified; and the designation of Śakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole class, although it is to some of the series: for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Puráńa."† That is, that there is no incompati-

as a mere mortal, though frequently as a divine person. But is not that precisely the character of an incarnation,—a man, occasionally displaying the powers of a god?

[1] The Puráńas are divided into three classes,—named *Sáttwika*, *Támasa*, and *Rájasa*,—consisting, each, of six Puráńas.

[2] No passage in the *Padma Puráńa* authorizes this remark.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XXII.

† *Ibid.*, pp. XXI., XXII.

bility in the Puráńas—which have immemorially been held to be sacred books,—inculcating a worship not only directly contrary to the Vedas, but which even requires, for its due performance, flesh, fish, wine, women, and which is attended "with the most scandalous orgies amongst the votaries." The mere mention, however, of such an opinion is, alone, sufficient to show its improbability; and Professor Wilson correctly observes: "The occurrence of these impurities is, certainly, countenanced by the texts which the sects regard as authorities, and by a very general belief of their occurrence. The members of the sect are enjoined secrecy,—which, indeed, it might be supposed they would observe on their own account,—and, consequently, will not acknowledge their participation in such scenes."[1] It is, therefore, surprising that, notwithstanding his own previous account of the Śáktas, he should remark, in the Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*: "The date of the Kúrma Puráńa cannot be very remote; for it is, avowedly, posterior to the establishment of the Tántrika, the Śákta, and the Jaina sects. In the twelfth chapter it is said: 'The Bhairava, Váma, Árhata, and Yámala Śástras are intended for delusion.'"* The passage here referred to is, at length, as follows: "Certain acts have been prescribed to Brahmans and others; and for those who do

---

[1] These three quotations will be found in Professor Wilson's "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," in the *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XVII., pp. 223, 224, 225.†

---

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXXIX., LXXX.

† Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 256—260.

not perform these acts are prepared the lowest hells. But there is no other Śástra than the Vedas which deserves the name of virtuous; and Brahmans, therefore, ought not to delight in reciting the *Yoni Sástras*, which are of various kinds in this world; because they belong to the quality of darkness, and are contrary to the Śruti and Smŕiti: of these are the Kapála, the Bhairava, the Yámala, the Váma, and the Árhata. Thus, for the purpose of deception, are there many such Śástras; and by these false Śástras are many men deceived." This passage, it is evident, condemns these sects, and could not, therefore, have been written by a person who belonged to some one of them. But I have quoted it in order to show the manner in which allusions to philosophical and religious sects occur, in a few instances, in some of the Puráńas; for, in all such passages, the name only is mentioned, and the doctrine of the sect is never in the least explained. Before, therefore, it is concluded that the name applies to a sect of modern origin, it should, surely, be first proved that no sect existed in India, under that name, until the establishment of the modern sect. In the above quotation, the worship of Śiva in his terrific character, and of Deví as Śakti, is, no doubt, clearly intimated; but it affords no indication of the date when such worship commenced, or of the period during which it may have been prevalent. But it is stated, in more than one Puráńa, that the Kapála sect was coeval with the institution of the worship of the Linga; and its antiquity is, further, rendered probable by its having long become extinct in India; and it is evident that, as the Árhata is here distinctly called a *Yoni*

(that is, a *Śákta,*) *Śástra*, this term can have no reference whatever to the Jaina sect. Were, also, the Tántrika doctrines really inculcated in the Puráńas, the passages relating to them would be so numerous and explicit as to attract attention; and yet, in my examination of those works, I have never met with a single Tántrika passage; and Professor Wilson adduces only the above-quoted text of the *Kúrma Puráńa*, which can prove nothing, until the sects alluded to, in it, are satisfactorily ascertained. To found, consequently, any argument with respect to the date when the Puráńas, as now extant, were written, or their sectarian tendency, on a few obscure passages which occur in them, the precise meaning of which it is now impossible to determine, is, surely, a mode of reasoning which may be justly pronounced to be altogether futile and fallacious.

Professor Wilson also states, in too decided and unqualified a manner, that, "In a word, the religion of the Vedas was not idolatry:"* for he, at the same time, correctly remarks that "It is yet, however, scarcely safe to advance an opinion of the precise† belief or philosophy which they inculcate."‡ But it unquestionably appears, from several of the Upanishads,—which are admitted § to be portions of the Vedas,—that the principal deities have always been represented by images; and it may, therefore, be justly inferred that image-worship has always formed part of the Hindu religion. In its purest form, however, it

* Vol. I., Preface, p. III. † The word 'precise' was here omitted.

‡ Vol. I., Preface, p. II.

§ Not with any scientific accuracy.

is probable that the worship of images was practised particularly by the inferior castes, and not, generally, by the Brahmans and Kshattriyas; but that, when the strict observance of the system of religious worship prescribed by the Vedas began to decline, then idolatry gradually assumed that form under which it appears in India at the present day. That such a change has taken place in the Hindu religion is clearly shown in the Puráńas; for, in those works, though the worship of particular deities by various rites and observances is principally inculcated, they still contain numerous passages in which it is explicitly declared that such worship is not the adoration which is most acceptable to the Supreme Being, or the most effectual for obtaining final beatitude.

But the following remarks may appear to fix a modern character on the eighteen Puráńas, as now extant: "It is a distinguishing feature of the Vishńu Puráńa, and it is characteristic of its being the work of an earlier period than most of the Puráńas, that it enjoins no sectarial or other acts of supererogation; no Vratas, occasional self-imposed observances; no holydays, no birthdays of Kŕishńa, no nights dedicated to Lakshmí; no sacrifices or modes of worship other than those conformable to the ritual of the Vedas. It contains no Máhátmyas or golden legends, even of the temples in which Vishńu is adored."* In these remarks, however, it is *assumed* that sacrifices and modes of worship which are not conformable to the ritual of the Vedas are prescribed in the Puráńas: but

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XCIX., C.

this is precisely the question which requires to be proved. It is probable that the worship of images is not authorized by the Vedas; and so far, therefore, the Puráńas inculcate a mode of worship which is not conformable to the ritual of the Vedas. But idolatry has, unquestionably, existed, in India, from the remotest times; and, consequently, its being inculcated in the Puráńas cannot be admitted as any proof of their being modern compositions. The invocations, also, and prayers to the different deities, contained in the Puráńas appear to be in strict accordance with such as are contained in the Vedas; for they are composed of the *Gáyatrí* and, apparently, of other texts of the Vedas; and, although the rites and offerings with which the deities are directed to be worshipped may, probably, differ from the ritual of the Vedas, they still have been, evidently, intended to conform to it, as far as the difference of image-worship would admit of.[1] Sacrifices are not prescribed in the Puráńas; and the description of such as are mentioned in them is, no doubt, conformable to the ritual of the Vedas. It is not, therefore, the modes of worship which the Puráńas prescribe, upon which any argument to prove the remodelling of the Hindu religion in modern times can be validly founded; for their simplicity, and their

---

[1] It is unnecessary to except, expressly, the worship of Deví by the sacrifice of animals; for Professor Wilson has remarked (*Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XVII., p. 219):* "This practice, however, is not considered as orthodox, and approaches rather to the ritual of the Vámácharins; the more pure *Bali* [sacrifice] consisting of edible grain, with milk and sugar."

* Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 251, 252.

accordance, in all essential respects, with the ritual of the Vedas must render it most probable that such modes of worship were practised long prior to the Christian era. Nor will the other acts specified by Professor Wilson afford support to his opinion. I do not, indeed, understand what is here intended by "sectarial or other acts of supererogation:" but the fourth order, or that of the ascetic, is mentioned in the Institutes of Manu; and the Yogin is frequently mentioned in the Upanishads; and, surely, the sufferings and deprivations to which the ascetic and Yogin subject themselves, for the purpose of obtaining beatitude, are, decidedly, acts of supererogation. The inculcating, therefore, in the Puráńas, the advantage to be derived from such acts can be no proof that those works were written in modern times, for sectarian purposes. There then remain to be considered only self-imposed observances, holydays, birthdays of Kŕishńa, and nights dedicated of Lakshmí. But Professor Wilson has invalidated his argument by the mention of Lakshmí; for, most certainly, that goddess has not been an object of peculiar worship in modern times; and her festival, therefore, must have been derived from the ancient calendar. It is singular, also, that the description of holydays and festivals should be adduced as an argument against the antiquity of a religious work; for these have been coeval with the institution of every religion; and such self-imposed observances as fasts and vows are too common, in all religions, to admit of their mention in a religious work being considered as a valid argument against its antiquity. Such description and mention, therefore, are, in themselves, no proof of the

period when the Puráńas were composed; and Professor Wilson has not proved (nor can he, I am convinced, prove,) that the deity to whose honour a festival is ascribed in the Puráńas, or in whose propitiation a fast or vow is directed to be performed, was not worshipped prior to the eighth or ninth century, or that the preceding mode of worship has been since altered. But, until either of these assumptions is proved, it must be evident that the mention of the festival, the fast, or the vow, in any of the Puráńas, in no manner proves, or even renders it probable, that that Puráńa did not exist prior to the Christian era, in precisely the same state as that in which it is now extant.

I admit, however, that doubts may be reasonably entertained with respect to the antiquity of some of the legends relating to temples and places of pilgrimage, which are contained in the Puráńas; for the miscellaneous nature, the want of arrangement, and the humility of style of the Puráńas would easily admit of an account of a particular temple or place of pilgrimage being interpolated, without the interpolation being liable to detection from the context.* It is, therefore, possible that, when those works are further examined, such interpolations may be discovered in them; but, were it, for instance, even proved that the legend of Jagannátha in the *Brahma Puráńa* was an interpolation, this would be no proof that that Puráńa was written for the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha: for it would be much more reasonable to suppose that the Brahmans of that temple had availed

---

* Contrast what is said in p. 311, note 1, *infra*.

themselves of the original Purána, to introduce into it, and to circulate under the sacredness of its name, the legend which they had composed in honour of their god. When, therefore, a passage occurs in any Purána, which has a modern appearance, it should not, at once, be concluded that the Purána is a modern composition; but it should first be ascertained whether the passage is really modern, and, if so, whether it may not be an interpolation which does not necessarily affect the antiquity of the Purána itself.[1] Nothing, however, is so difficult as to decide satisfactorily on the existence of a supposed interpolation in any work; and, with respect to the Puránas, this difficulty, from the reasons just mentioned, and from our almost entire ignorance of the history of India during the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era, becomes so insuperable as clearly to evince how completely er-

[1] In forming, however, an opinion of the genuineness and entireness of the Puránas, as now extant, it should be recollected that these works are written in Sanskrit, and that the Brahmans have always been, alone, acquainted with that language.* The Puránas, therefore, circulated amongst the Brahmans only; and it, consequently, seems in the highest degree improbable that the Brahmans of all India would admit into their copies of these sacred books interpolations which were merely intended to serve some local purpose. It is, at least, certain that the manuscripts of the Puránas which are, at this day, spread over India, from Cashmere to the extremity of the southern peninsula, and from Jagannátha to Dwáraká, contain precisely the same works; and it is, therefore, most probable that the Puránas have always been preserved in precisely the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing.

* Never, in all probability, has this been the case.

roneous it must be to conclude, from their internal evidence, that "the Puráńas are works of evidently different ages, and have been compiled under different circumstances."*

But it is impossible to ascertain, from this Preface, Professor Wilson's precise opinion with respect to what a work ought to be, in order to entitle it to the character of a Puráńa; for, in speaking of the *Linga*, he remarks: "Data for conjecturing the era of this work are defective. But it is more of a ritual than a Puráńa; and the Pauráńik chapters which it has inserted, in order to keep up something of its character, have been, evidently, borrowed for the purpose."† In considering, however, the age and the scope and tendency of the Puráńas, Professor Wilson has entirely overlooked the sacred character which has immemorially been ascribed to those works; and yet he could not intend to deny so indisputable a fact; in which case it must be evident that the more a Puráńa is occupied in "narrating legends, and enjoining rites, and reciting prayers,"† the more it maintains its proper character. Professor Wilson, on the contrary, is of opinion that the religious instruction which is contained in the present Puráńas is a decisive proof that they have undergone some material alteration, and that they are not the same works which were current in the century prior to Christianity. He admits, at the same time, the accuracy of this description of the Puráńas, as they are:[1] The principal object of the Puráńas is the moral and

[1] In my work on Ancient and Hindu Mythology, p. 150.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI. † *Ibid.*, p. LXIX.

religious instruction which is inculcated in them, and to which all the legends that they contain are rendered subservient. In fact, the description of the earth and of the planetary system, and the lists of royal races, that occur in them are, evidently, extraneous, and not essential, circumstances; as they are omitted in some Puráńas, and very concisely discussed in others; while, on the contrary, in all the Puráńas, some or other of the leading principles, rites, and observances of the Hindu religion are fully dwelt upon, and illustrated, either by suitable legends, or by prescribing the ceremonies to be practised, and the prayers and invocations to be employed, in the worship of different deities. It will, I think, be admitted that these are precisely the topics which ought to occupy a sacred book intended for the religious instruction of the Hindus; and that, consequently, so far from its being supposed that the present Puráńas have undergone some material alteration in consequence of these topics being their principal subject, this very circumstance should be considered as a conclusive argument in support of their genuineness and antiquity. As, also, the religious instruction contained in the Puráńas is perfectly uniform, and entirely consistent with the principles of the Hindu religion, and as it, consequently, betrays not the slightest indication of novelty or sectarianism, it must be most consistent with probability to conclude that the eighteen Puráńas, as now extant, are ancient compositions, and not, as Professor Wilson supposes, an "intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients" with "ancient materials."*

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.

I have, thus, examined the arguments adduced, by Professor Wilson, to prove that the books now extant under the name of Puráńas are not the original eighteen Puráńas which have been immemorially held to form part of the sacred literature of the Hindus, but works which have been compiled, within the last eight hundred years, from ancient and modern materials, and written in subservience to sectarial imposture. The remarks, however, contained in this and my former letter will, perhaps, evince that those arguments are much too inconsistent and inconclusive to render the antiquity and genuineness of the present Puráńas in the least questionable. The admission, indeed, that the original Puráńas were extant in the century prior to the Christian era, is, alone, sufficient to invalidate all suppositions of their being, now, no longer in existence; and, unless, therefore, the time and manner of their becoming extinct are proved, it must be evident that inferences resting merely on their internal evidence cannot be received as any proof that the original Puráńas have not been preserved until the present day. For all reasoning founded on the internal evidence which the Puráńas may afford on any point can be of no avail; as there are, I believe, scarcely any persons competent to decide upon its correctness; and the different conclusions which Professor Wilson and myself have drawn from this internal evidence must show that the impression received from it depends entirely on the disposition of mind and the spirit of research with which the Puráńas are perused. I read them with a mind perfectly free from all preconceived opinion, and with the sole object of making myself

acquainted with the mythology and religion of the Hindus; and I did not observe, in them, the slightest indication of their having been written in modern times, for sectarian purposes; but, on the contrary, their perusal irresistibly led me to conclude that they must have been written at some remote period. Even Professor Wilson has not been able to resist this impression of their antiquity; for he declares that it is "as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of* the Puráńas."† Why, therefore, he should have endeavoured—particularly, in his account of each of the Puráńas,—to demonstrate that those works are modern compilations, and that, in consequence, "they are no longer authorities for Hindu belief, as a whole," but "special guides for separate and, sometimes, conflicting branches of it,"‡ I pretend not to conjecture.

But it is very evident that Professor Wilson examined the Puráńas with a preconceived opinion of their being modern compilations, and of their containing an account of the sects which have originated in India in modern times;[1] for it is only from the influence of such a preconceived opinion that can have proceeded

[1] I cannot avoid observing, with reference to Professor Wilson's account of the manner in which his analyses of the Puráńas are made, contained in No. IX. of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, p. 61,§ that it appears to me that no series of indices, abstracts, and translations of particular parts of the Puráńas will ever enable any person either to form, himself, or to

* The words "the contents of" were omitted by the Colonel.

† Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. V.

§ Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., p. 2. Also see Vol. III. of the present Work, p. 225, last foot-note.

the contradictory and fallacious reasoning, with respect to the age and the scope and tendency of the Puráńas, which is contained in the Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*. Because that reasoning rests entirely on two assumptions, neither of which is proved nor can be proved: the one, that a genuine Puráńa should treat of profane subjects only; and the other, that the works now extant under the name of Puráńas were written in modern times, for sectarian purposes. Thus, in the account of each of the Puráńas, it is pronounced that the main object of the *Brahma* is the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha (Kŕishńa), and that there is little, in it, which corresponds with the definition of a Puráńa; that the different portions of the *Padma* "are, in all probability, as many different works, neither of which approaches to the original definition of a Puráńa;" that the *Linga* "is more a ritual than a Puráńa;" that the *Brahma Vaivarta* "has not the slightest title to be regarded as a Puráńa;" that the date of the *Kúrma* "cannot be very remote, for it is, avowedly,

communicate to others, "a correct notion of the substance and character of those works." The Puráńa must not only be read from beginning to end, but examined over again more than once, before any person can be qualified to pronounce a decided judgment upon its age, scope, or tendency. The most ample index of its contents will never suggest or supply those reflections which necessarily arise during its perusal, and which, alone, can produce a correct opinion with respect to the connexion which the different parts of the Puráńa bear to each other, and with respect to the principal or accessory objects of its composition. A more attentive consideration of the context, for instance, would, perhaps, have prevented Professor Wilson from quoting the line of the *Kúrma Puráńa*, on which I have remarked in this letter.

posterior to the establishment of the Tántrika, the Śákta, and the Jaina sects;"* and so with respect to the other Puráńas. It will not, however, be denied that nothing but the most attentive and repeated actual perusal of the whole of each and all of the Puráńas would warrant such positive and unqualified assertions, and that nothing but satisfactory proof of such perusal would entitle them to the least credit; and yet Professor Wilson has stated that the Puráńas comprehend a quantity of lines which any European scholar could scarcely expect to peruse with care and attention, unless his whole time were devoted, exclusively, for very many years, to the task.[1] Professor Wilson, therefore, is not, according to his own admission, qualified to decide *ex cathedrâ* on the age, or the scope and tendency, of the Puráńas. His reasoning, also, in support of the opinions which he had expressed on these points is singularly illogical; for he, first, assumes that a genuine Puráńa ought to treat of such and such topics only, and then—as not one of the present Puráńas conforms to the definition[2] assumed,—he at once concludes that those works are modern compilations. But, as the definition fails in eighteen instances, it must appear most

[1] *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, No. IX., p. 61.†

[2] Professor Wilson, also, has not translated this definition literally from the Sanskrit; and he, thus, argues, not on it, but on the meaning which he has, himself, thought proper to give to the definition. Literally translated, it can mean nothing more than "creation,‡ repeated creation, races or families, *manwantaras*,§ and

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XXVIII., XXXIII., LXIX., LXVII., and LXXIX.

† *Vide supra*, p. 297, note §.

‡ See the Colonel's remark on *sarga*, in p. 259, *supra*.

§ This is transliteration, not translation.

probable that it was never intended to be understood in the very restricted sense which Professor Wilson applies to it; and, in my former letter, I have shown that two of the topics, at least, comprise much more than what he has included under them. The non-conformity, however, of the contents of the present Puráńas to this assumed definition—the precise extent and meaning of which are not ascertained,—is, in fact, the only argument which is adduced, by Professor Wilson, to prove that the works now bearing the name of Puráńas are not the original Puráńas, and the only ground on which he pronounces that this or that one of those works does not correspond with the definition of a genuine Puráńa. But the mere statement of such an argument is, surely, quite sufficient to expose its total invalidity. The other assumption is not only equally groundless, but it is even disproved by Professor Wilson himself; for he has rested his argument, in support of it, entirely on Kŕishńa being, as the juvenile Kŕishńa, the peculiar object of worship of a sect of known modern origin; and yet he is obliged to admit that

---

what accompanies races." To found, therefore, an argument against the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráńas, as now extant, on such a definition, is, surely, a most singular and futile mode of reasoning.*

---

* This is hypercriticism. For the original terms referred to, see Vol. I., Preface, p. VII., note 1; also, Vol. III., p. 67, and p. 71, note; and *supra*, pp. 169 and 244. Professor Wilson's expansions, to be found in Vol. I., Preface, p. VII., are fully authorized. Colebrooke, in his edition of the *Amara-kośa*, p. 33, following the authority of scholiasts, defines a Puráńa to be "theogony, comprising past and future events, under five heads: the creation; the destruction and renovation of worlds; genealogy of gods and heroes; the reigns of Manus; and the transactions of their descendants."

Kŕishńa is not represented in that character in three of the Puráńas in which his life is related at length. The only proof, also, of the Tántrika doctrines being inculcated in the Puráńas, which is adduced, is a single obscure line of the *Kúrma Puráńa.** But, were that the case, there could have been no difficulty in quoting numerous Tántrika passage from some one or other of the Puráńas; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has not supported his opinion by producing such passages, it may be justly concluded that not one of the Puráńas in any manner advocates "a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion."†

The more, therefore, that I consider the remarks contained in the Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, the more am I at a loss to understand how Professor Wilson could express such contradictory opinions. For he maintains, for instance, "that Brahmans unknown to fame have remodelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and, especially, the Puráńas, cannot reasonably be contested;"‡ but he equally contends that the internal evidence of the Puráńas furnishes decisive proof "of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of the Puráńas."§ On the contrary, it would, surely, be irrational to admit either, after Professor Wilson has proved—as he supposes,—that the works now bearing the name of Puráńas are "an intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively

* See Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXXIX., LXXX.

† *Ibid.*, pp. XXI., XXII.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. XCVIII., XCIX.

§ *Ibid.*, p. XCIX.

modern ingredients,"* and that not one of those works conforms to the definition of a genuine Puráńa. It becomes, therefore, requisite either to deny the antiquity and authenticity of the present Puráńas, or to contest the assumption that the Brahmans have remodelled their sacred books,—a supposition so totally improbable, that nothing but the most clear and incontrovertible proof could render it at all credible. Until, consequently, Professor Wilson produces such proof, it must appear most rational and reasonable to conclude that the Brahmans have never remodelled their sacred books (as no motive for their doing so can be conceived), and that the Puráńas now extant, having been preserved in the same manner as other Sanskrit manuscripts of the same period, are, in all essential respects, precisely the same works which were current in India in the century prior to the Christian era.

Bombay, 29*th Sept.*, 1840.

VANS KENNEDY.

SIR: Notwithstanding my two former letters, there are still one or two points on which I would wish to offer a few remarks, in order to complete my observations on Professor Wilson's objections to the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráńas, as now extant. For it will, I think, be admitted that this question is discussed in a very unsatisfactory manner in the Pre-

* See Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX. Only Professor Wilson makes no such assertion. His words are quoted correctly in p. 295, *ad calcem*, *supra*.

face to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*; as that Preface contains merely the conclusions which Professor Wilson has drawn from certain circumstances that are represented solely according to the view which he has taken of them; and, thus, the reader is not afforded the means of judging whether this view is correct, or otherwise. But an inquirer into the real character of the mythology and religion of the Hindus would, no doubt, wish to know the grounds on which Professor Wilson states: "It is not possible to conjecture when this more simple and primitive form of adoration [of the Vedas,] was succeeded by the worship of images and types, representing Brahmá, Vishńu, Śiva, and other imaginary beings, constituting a mythological pantheon of most ample extent; or when Ráma and Kŕishńa, who appear to have been, originally, real and historical characters, were elevated to the dignity of divinities."* In that Preface, however,—and in all, I believe, that Professor Wilson has yet published respecting the Puráńas,—the most questionable assertions are made in the most positive manner; but they remain unsupported by either argument or authority; and, consequently, not even the deference which is justly due to Professor Wilson, as an accomplished Sanskrit scholar, should preclude an examination of his opinions, or the rejection of such as are inconsistent in themselves, or contrary to probability and evidence.

It is particularly remarkable that, in that Preface, Professor Wilson has passed over a material fact,—the sacred character of the Puráńas,—without a due consideration of which it is impossible to form a correct

* Vol. I., Preface, p. IV.

judgment with respect to their age, and their scope and tendency. But it is undeniable that certain works named Puráńas have immemorially been held, by the Hindus, to be sacred books of divine origin, and, therefore, entitled to the greatest veneration. Even at the present day, those works are regarded with the same reverence, and are, in consequence, considered to be incommunicable to Śúdras, women, and barbarians:* and, on this account, a Brahman in my employment declined to read the Puráńas with me; while another Brahman, though he conversed with me on the subjects treated of in those works, and even gave me hints where to find particular passages, would not open the Puráńa in which they were contained, in my presence, and show me the passages.† In judging, therefore, whether the Puráńas now extant have been preserved, to the present day, in precisely the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing, the sacred character of those books should, most assuredly, be taken into consideration, and not passed over as of no consequence; for this circumstance, alone, renders it, in the highest degree, improbable that the Brahmans would allow the Puráńas to be lost, and utterly incredible that they would suppress any one of those sacred books, and substitute, in its place, another work of the same name. On this incredible supposition, however, Professor Wilson's opinion, that the present Puráńas are modern compilations, entirely rests. But he has not attempted to explain the manner in which the replacing of the original Pu-

* A grosser error than this was never committed to paper.

† Colonel Kennedy's Bráhmans must have been very peculiar.

ráńas by new works was effected; and, consequently, his positive and unqualified statement, that the date of the earliest of the present Puráńas is not prior to the ninth century, is a mere gratuitous assertion, which is not only contrary to probability, but which is even left unsupported by any proof whatever. But every principle of reasoning requires that, before the conclusion is drawn, the premisses of the argument should be, first, established; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has neither proved nor rendered probable the premisses from which he draws the startling and questionable conclusion, that the present Puráńas have no title to be regarded as genuine Puráńas, it must be evident that his opinion on this point must be considered to be totally groundless.

Another point essential to the proper discussion of this question is, the ascertaining what it is that should be held to constitute a genuine Puráńa; although it might be supposed that no difference of opinion could exist respecting it: for, the Puráńas being sacred books, their contents should, of course, relate, principally, to the rites, ceremonies, offerings, prayers, and invocations with which the deities mentioned in them are to be worshipped, and to the legends and doctrines of the Hindu religion. Professor Wilson, on the contrary, has stated that "The earliest inquiries into the religion, chronology, and history of the Hindus ascertained that there existed a body of writings especially devoted to those subjects.... These were the Puráńas of Sanskrit literature."[1]*

[1] In the Analysis of the *Brahma Puráńa*, contained in No. IX.

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., p. 1.

But this statement is altogether erroneous; for not a single Puráńa contains chronology and history, in the meaning usually given to these terms; and, in the description of a Puráńa, given in that Analysis, are omitted that essential part of all the Puráńas which treats of the mythology and religion of the Hindus, and that part which has induced Professor Wilson to pronounce that the *Linga* is more of a ritual than a Puráńa. In his examination, therefore, of the Puráńas, he has, avowedly, overlooked topics the due consideration of which is indispensable for the forming a correct opinion of their age, object, and tendency. But this will be best rendered evident by a few remarks on his Analysis of the *Brahma Puráńa*, contained in No. IX. of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*.

In my last letter I was unavoidably led to observe that Professor Wilson had, evidently, examined the Puráńas under the influence of preconceived opinion; and this Analysis completely confirms that remark: for, at its very commencement, he states that "the first verses of the Brahma Puráńa" .... "sufficiently declare its sectarial bias, and indicate it to be a Vaishńava work."* But, in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus",†

---

of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. In this‡ it is also said that a genuine Puráńa "should treat of the creation and renovation§ of the universe, the division of time, the institutes of law and religion, the genealogies of the patriarchal families, and the dynasties of kings." But no other topics than these are mentioned.

---

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., p. 8, 9.

† *Ibid.*, Vol. I., pp. 3 and 30. ‡ *Ibid.*, Vol. III., p. 1.

§ General Kennedy omitted the words "and renovation".

Professor Wilson admits that the preferential worship of Vishńu is perfectly orthodox; and, in the Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, he states that one-third only of the *Brahma Puráńa* is dedicated to Vishńu's incarnation as Jagannátha.* Consequently, it is evident that this Puráńa is neither sectarian nor exclusively dedicated to the legend of Jagannátha. But this erroneous impression has, evidently, led him to affirm, as erroneously, (unless my copy of this Puráńa differs from his), that "the first chapter of the Puráńa describes the creation, which it attributes to Náráyańa or Vishńu, as one with Brahmá or Íśwara." For the only verse to which he can refer will bear no other meaning than this: "Comprehend, O reverend Munis, Brahmá, of boundless splendour, the creator of all beings, Náráyańa, the all-pervading."[1] But this error is of material importance; because, in this Puráńa, Brahmá is represented as the Supreme Being; and, had it, therefore, been composed after the general worship of Brahmá had entirely ceased,—as it did in remote times,—and the preeminence (as at this day,) of either Vishńu or Śiva had been established, it seems altogether improbable that such a distinction would have been ascribed to Brahmá by any writer. The representing, consequently, Brahmá as the Supreme Being, in four of the Puráńas,—the *Brahma*,

[1] तं बुध्यध्वं मुनिश्रेष्ठा ब्रह्माणममितौजसम् ।
स्रष्टारं सर्वभूतानां नारायणं परायणम् ॥

It is quite clear that *Náráyańam* is here placed in apposition with *Brahmáńam*, and that it is, therefore, an epithet of Brahmá, and not of Vishńu.

* Not so. See Vol. I., Preface, p. XXVIII., note 1.

Váyu, *Kúrma*, and *Brahmáńda*,—was a circumstance which, certainly, deserved particular attention; because it corresponds with the character in which Brahmá is represented in several of the Upanishads and in the Institutes of Manu. When, therefore, a circumstance so indicatory of the antiquity of the Puráńas is passed over by Professor Wilson, it must be evident that his conjectures respecting the dates when those works, as now extant, were compiled, are not entitled to the slightest consideration.

Professor Wilson also attaches no importance to the long account of the Sun and his worship, which is contained in the *Brahma Puráńa*; although this, undoubtedly, indicates that it cannot be a modern composition. And a similar description of the worship of the Sun, contained in the *Linga Puráńa*, is not even noticed by him, notwithstanding that it contains the *Gáyatrí* and, apparently, other verses of the Vedas. But it seems unquestionable that, if the Sun was ever an object of popular worship in remote antiquity, this worship had assumed a mysterious character at the time that the Vedas received their present form, and had become restricted to the Brahmans; for Mr. Ward has correctly observed that "the Brahmans consider Súrya as one of the greatest of the gods; because, in glory, he resembles the one Brahma, who is called *tejomaya*, or 'the glorious'. In the Vedas, also, this god is much noticed. The celebrated invocation called the *Gáyatrí*, and many of the forms of meditation, prayer, and praise, used in the daily ceremonies of the Brahmans, are addressed to him."[1] The descriptions, there-

[1] Ward's *View of the Hindus*, Vol. I., p. 50.

fore, of a worship so ancient and so celebrated in the Vedas, contained in at least two of the Puráńas,[1] should not, surely, have been overlooked by Professor Wilson, when deciding upon the period when the present Puráńas were compiled; for these descriptions clearly prove that those works must be ancient, and not modern, compositions.

In the same manner, Professor Wilson takes no notice of the identification, in the *Brahma Puráńa*, of Brahmá, Vishńu, Śiva, and Súrya with the Supreme Being; but, on the contrary, he contends that its main object is the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha. This conclusion, however, is directly contradicted by the contents of that Puráńa; because it appears, from them, that the legend of Jagannátha occupies one-third only of the work, and that, in it, preeminence is not attributed exclusively to Vishńu. It is, hence, evident that the view taken by Professor Wilson of the object and tendency of the Puráńas cannot possibly be correct; since he, thus, discovers a sectarial bias in a Puráńa which so clearly illustrates that predominant principle of the Hindu religion which inculcates that the preferential worship of particular deities is equally meritorious; for it is, in fact, the worship of the Supreme Being under those forms. But Professor Wilson is not content with pronouncing that the *Brahma Puráńa* is a Vaishńava work; for he, at the same time, states that it "is referred to the Śákta class, in

---

[1] This worship is also mentioned in the *Garuda Puráńa*; but I do not immediately recollect whether it is mentioned in any other of the Puráńas.

which the worship of Śakti, the personified female principle, is more particularly inculcated."* It is not for me to explain how any composition can be both a Vaishńava and a Tántrika work; but the assumption that there is a class of Puráńas denominated *Sákta* is totally unfounded. The division of the Puráńas into three classes is mentioned in the *Padma Puráńa* alone; and all that is said, in it, is, that such and such Puráńas —naming them,—are included in the *Sáttwika*, *Rájasa*, or *Támasa* class.[1] Nothing, therefore, contained in the *Padma Puráńa* in the least authorizes the remark just quoted; and in not one of the Puráńas is Deví ever represented under the same character as the Śakti of the Tántrika sect. It, hence, unquestionably appears that Professor Wilson has completely mistaken the object and tendency of the very Puráńa which he professes to have carefully analysed; and it must, therefore, follow that indices and abstracts of the Puráńas will never enable any person to form, himself, or to communicate to others, "a correct notion of the substance and character of these works."†

Professor Wilson, however, hesitates not to pronounce that "It is, nevertheless, obvious that such a Brahma Puráńa as has been here described cannot have any pretension to be considered as an ancient work, as the earliest of the Puráńas, or even as a Puráńa at

[1] This division, also, is entirely fanciful; for there is nothing contained in any one of the Puráńas which at all justifies it; as the subjects treated of in those works are of precisely a similar nature, and, in all of them, the same tenets and doctrines are inculcated.

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., p. 9. † *Ibid.*, p. 6.

all."* He, thus, first gives a completely erroneous account of the real nature of the contents of this Puráńa, and then concludes that it is not even a Puráńa at all! The question, also, recurs: What is a Puráńa? Professor Wilson contends that it is a work which "should treat" only "of the creation and renovation of the universe, the division of time, the institutes of law and religion, the genealogies of the patriarchal families, and the dynasties of kings:" but the Sanskrit authority to which he refers, and which occurs at the commencement of several of the Puráńas, says, merely, "creation, repeated creation, families, *manwantaras*, and what accompanies families."† From such a definition as this it is obvious that no opinion can be formed with respect to the subjects which should, alone, be treated of in a Puráńa; and yet Professor Wilson's objections to the genuineness of the Puráńas, as now extant, rests principally on their non-conformity to this unintelligible definition. For this appears to be the only reason that has led him to pronounce that the *Brahma* is not even a Puráńa at all; because "the greater portion of the work belongs to the class of Máhátmyas,[1]—

[1] There is no class of Máhátmyas; but passages, bearing that name, the authenticity of which cannot be contested,—as, for instance, the *Deví Máhátmya*‡ in the *Márkańdeya Puráńa*,—have been extracted from the Puráńas, and circulated as distinct works; and there seems to be no doubt that, in later times, works have been written in imitation of the authentic Máhátmyas; but their

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., pp. 16, 17.

† *Vide supra*, p. 299, note 2, and p. 300, note •

‡ It would be curious to know why the Colonel excepted it.

legendary and local descriptions of the greatness or holiness of particular temples, or individual divinities."* But, as usual, he does not explain why the description of a particular temple, or an individual divinity, should be considered as incompatible with the ancient and original composition of the Puráńa in which it is contained. He merely assumes that the temple of Kanárka, mentioned in this Puráńa, is the same as the Black Pagoda, built A.D. 1241, and that the temple of Jagannátha of the Puráńa is the same as that which was built in A.D. 1198; and hence concludes that the *Brahma Puráńa* was written in the course of the thirteenth or fourteenth century.† But he adduces neither argument nor proof in support of this assumption; although, in order to warrant it, it was indispensable to prove that no temple of Kanárka or Jagannátha ever existed in the same situations until the present temples were erected. For it may be equally assumed that the temples mentioned in this Puráńa were built, and had attained celebrity, several centuries prior to the Christian era: and in what manner is this assumption to be disproved? The history of India during the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era is almost unknown; and consequently, there are, now, no means available for determining the dates when the temples were erected, when the places of pilgrimage acquired holiness, when

---

spuriousness can always be detected by their not being to be found in the Puráńas‡ to which they are ascribed.

---

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., p. 17. † *Ibid.*, p. 18.

‡ And the *Máhátmyas* therein found are, in all likelihood, later than their contexts.

the kings and distinguished personages lived,* or when the events occurred which are mentioned in the Puráńas. To all these works this remark of Professor Wilson applies: "The Vishńu Puráńa has kept very clear of particulars from which an approximation to its date may be conjectured."† For, as far as I have observed, not one of the Puráńas contains a single circumstance from which it would be possible to determine even the period when it may have been composed. The mere supposition, therefore, that the temples mentioned in the *Brahma Puráńa* are the same as those built in A.D. 1198 and 1241 cannot be admitted as a sufficient ground for deciding that that Puráńa is of modern date; for there is nothing improbable in concluding that other temples of the same names, and in the same situations, may have existed long before those erected in modern times were in existence.

The only reason, also, that can have led Professor Wilson to suppose that descriptions of temples and places of pilgrimage should not be contained in the Puráńas, is the above-mentioned definition; as it, certainly, does not include such a topic. But it is highly probable that pilgrimages to sacred places, and the visiting of temples, was practised, in remote times, by the Hindus, as they are practised by them at the present day; and no subject, therefore, could be more adapted to such a sacred book as a Puráńa, than de-

* Inscriptions have brought us acquainted with not a few facts tending to fix the age of later Pauráńik celebrities. And, inscriptions apart, could Colonel Kennedy doubt our knowing the age of Chandragupta?

† Vol. I., Preface, p. CXI.

scriptions of those celebrated places and temples a pilgrimage to which was deemed to be a pious and meritorious act.* The legends, also, relating to temples and places of pilgrimage, which occur in the Puráńas, are of precisely the same kind as those which have found a place in all religions, and cannot, consequently, be considered, in themselves, to be any proof against the antiquity of the Puráńa in which they are contained. Many of those places of pilgrimage are not frequented at the present day, and some of them cannot, now, be even ascertained; which circumstances must render it highly probable that they are of a remote period, and that they would not have been mentioned in a particular Puráńa, had they not been held in reverence at the time when it was composed. I admit that this is an unsatisfactory mode of arguing; but, in this instance, to supposition supposition can alone be opposed; for, as I have just observed, the internal evidence of the Puráńas affords no means of determining the date of any circumstance mentioned in them.

In his Analysis, therefore, of the *Brahma Puráńa*, Professor Wilson has, evidently, not only omitted circumstances which are essential to the forming a correct judgment of its object and tendency, but he has, also, under the obvious influence of preconceived opinion, found, in it, *that which it does not contain*, and attached an undue importance to an unintelligible definition, and to one-third only of the work, without taking the other two-thirds into his consideration.

* Temples and pilgrimages were not Hindu institutions "in remote times."

But nothing can more clearly evince the disposition of mind, and the attention with which Professor Wilson has examined the Puráńas, than this elaborate passage, contained in p. LIX. of the Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*: "A considerable portion [of the *Agni Puráńa*] is then appropriated to instructions for the performance of religious ceremonies, many of which belong to the Tántrika ritual, and are, apparently, transcribed from the principal authorities of that system. Some belong to mystical forms of Śaiva worship, little known in Hindusthán, though, perhaps, still practised in the south. One of these is the Díkshá, or initiation of a novice; *by which, with numerous ceremonies and invocations, in which the mysterious monosyllables of the Tantras are constantly repeated, the disciple is transformed into a living personation of Siva, and receives, in that capacity, the homage of his Guru.*[1]" For, throughout this passage, some one or other of the names of Vishńu continually occurs; and it is evident, therefore, that the passage relates to Vishńu, and not to Śiva. In regard, also to the *díkshá*, these verses, contained in the 27th Chapter, will be sufficient to prove that this initiation is in the name of Vishńu, and not of Śiva: "Having propitiated Fire, sacrifice to Vishńu; and, then, having called the novices, initiate them standing near."[2] This *díkshá* is

[1] Nothing contained in the passage of the *Agni Puráńa* here referred to in any manner authorizes the words which I have placed in italics. Mysterious monosyllables, also, are perfectly orthodox; for they occur in the *Upanishads*.

[2] मण्डलेऽथ यजेद्विष्णुं ततः संतर्प्य पावनम् ।
आहूय दीक्षयेच्छिष्यान्यदुपन्यासनस्थितान् ॥

also mentioned in the *Garuđa Puráńa*, in which it is equally said that the initiation is in the name of Hari or Vishńu; and not one of the prayers and invocations contained in those two passages is taken from the Tántrika ritual. It is, indeed, surprising that, after having written the accurate account[1] of the Śákta sect, contained in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," Professor Wilson should state that the *Garuđa Puráńa* contains prayers from the Tántrika ritual, addressed to the Sun, Śiva, and Vishńu; for he must be well aware that the Tántrika sect do not worship either Vishńu or the Sun. As, however, Professor Wilson has, in that Sketch, confined himself principally to the description of its distinguishing characteristics, —the *kumárí-pújá*, or worship of the virgin,—I add these remarks of Mr. Ward, in order to evince how totally impossible it must be to find such doctrines in the Puráńas: "The Tantras either set aside all these ceremonies [of the Vedas], or prescribe them in other

---

[1] I, of course, except this passage: "The adoration of Prakŕiti or Śakti is, to a certain extent, authorized by the Puráńas, particularly the Brahma Vaivarta, the Skanda, and the Káliká:"* the erroneousness of which I have, perhaps, demonstrated in these letters. I am, indeed, strongly inclined to suspect that Professor Wilson's employment of indices and abstracts for the examination of the Puráńas has often led him to conclude that the term Śakti, which occurs so frequently in those works, denoted Deví in her character of Śakti, as worshipped by the Śáktas. But, in the Puráńas, this term means power and energy in general; and, when it does not, it invariably denotes the energy of the Supreme Being, or Máyá, or the impersonified energies of the three principal gods.

---

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 247, 248.

forms." The Tántrika prayers, even for the same ceremony, differ from those of the Veda; and, in certain cases, they dispense with all ceremonies; assuring men that it is sufficient for a person to receive the initiatory incantation from his religious guide, to repeat the name of his guardian deity, and to serve his teacher. They actually forbid the person called *púrńábhishikta* to follow the rules of the Veda."[1]

In that Preface,* also, Professor Wilson observes: "Colonel Vans Kennedy, however, objects to the application of the term Śákta to this last division of the Puráńas [the *Rájasa*]; the worship of Śakti being the especial object of a different class of works, the Tantras; and no such form of worship being particularly inculcated in the Brahma Puráńa. This last argument is of weight in regard to the particular instance specified; and the designation of Śakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole class, although it is to some of the series: for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Puráńa." Professor Wilson is, thus, obliged to admit that he had completely mistaken the tendency of a Puráńa which he had analysed; and yet he not only adheres to his opinion, that some of the Puráńas belong to his imaginary Śákta class, but he has even advanced, in that Preface,† these extraordinary assertions: "The term Rájasa, implying the animation of passion, and enjoyment of sensual delights, is appli-

[1] Ward's *View of the Hindus*, Vol. IV., p. 365.

* Pp. XXI., XXII.
† P. XXII.

cable not only to the character of the youthful divinity [Kŕishńa], but to those with whom his adoration in these forms seems to have originated,—the Gosains of Gokul and Bengal, the followers and descendants of Vallabha and Chaitanya, the priests and proprietors of Jagannáth and Śrínáthdwár, who lead a life of affluence and indulgence, and vindicate, both by precept and practice, the reasonableness of the Rájasa property, and the congruity of temporal enjoyment with the duties of religion." All this, however, is not only totally erroneous, but it rests entirely on certain fanciful inferences which Professor Wilson has drawn from the meaning of the term *Rájasa*; which is, certainly, a most singular mode of reasoning. He is, here, also in direct contradiction with himself; for, in one part of the paragraph from which this quotation is taken, he says that the *Rájasa* Puráńas "lean to the Śákta division of the Hindus, the worshippers of Śakti, or the female principle;" and, in conclusion, he speaks of persons vindicating "the reasonableness of the Rájasa property, and the congruity of temporal enjoyment with the duties of religion." But Professor Wilson attempts not to explain how it can be possible that the same class of Puráńas should inculcate the pecular worship of both Kŕishńa and Śakti; nor what the leading a life of affluence and indulgence has to do with worshipping the *yoni* of a naked virgin; nor what resemblance there can be between the scandalous and abominable orgies of the Śáktas, and the calm though sensual enjoyment of life by the votaries of Kŕishńa, as above described. Nothing, indeed, can be more dissimilar than the worship of the juvenile Kŕishńa and that of Śakti; and,

when, therefore, Professor Wilson is of opinion that, in some of the Puráńas, both of these dissimilar worships are peculiarly enjoined, it must be evident that he has as much mistaken the object and tendency of the *Brahmáńda*, the *Brahma Vaivarta*, the *Márkańdeya*, the *Bhavishya*, and *Vámana Puráńas*, as he admits he was mistaken in placing the *Brahma Puráńa* in the Śákta class. I have also remarked, above, that this division of the Puráńas into three classes is mentioned in the *Padma Puráńa* alone; and that this Puráńa does not explain the reason why a particular Puráńa is assigned to a particular class. But, admitting this classification, it appears clearly, from it, that the Puráńas relating to Śiva are placed in the *Támasa* class; and, consequently, as Tántrika works are dedicated to Śiva and Deví, if the *Rájasa* class of Puráńas inculcate Tántrika doctrines,—as Professor Wilson supposes,—they ought, according to the principle of classification in the *Padma Puráńa*, to have been included in the *Támasa*, and not in the *Rájasa*, class. The writer, however, of that Puráńa has not so classed them; and, thus, all the reasoning which Professor Wilson has founded on the meaning of the term *Rájasa* is refuted by the very authority that he has adduced in support of it.

It is, at the same time, obvious that all the arguments adduced by Professor Wilson against the genuineness of the Puráńas, as now extant, presuppose that descriptions of rites and ceremonies, injunctions for the preferential worship of particular deities, legends, tenets and doctrines, and moral and religious instruction should not find a place in a genuine Puráńa; for

he takes no notice of those parts of the present Purá-ńas which relate to these subjects, and, thus, rejects at least two-thirds of the whole of the eighteen Puráńas now extant, as being spurious and modern. But it is evident that it is only from a due consideration of these subjects, and a careful comparison of what is said, respecting them, in one Puráńa, with what is said in the other Puráńas, that a correct opinion can possibly be formed with respect to whether those works exhibit one uniform religious system, or whether they indicate that heterodox doctrines have been introduced into them; for, if an undeniable uniformity exists—as I have no doubt it does,—in an aggregate of 1.600.000 lines, in the general description of rites, ceremonies, legends, and doctrines, no stronger internal evidence is, surely, requisite, to prove that the present Puráńas cannot be, as Professor Wilson supposes, an intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients.† Professor Wilson also avows that he has not read the Puráńas, and that the notices which he has given of their contents must have been taken from indices and abstracts, the accuracy of which I have never questioned.[1] But I am convinced that

[1] In his Analysis of the *Brahma Puráńa*, Professor Wilson has observed* that the manner in which he effected his examination of the Puráńas has been misconceived; and he may, possibly, refer to a letter which I addressed to you, and which appeared in the number of your Journal of March, 1837. In that letter I remarked, in a note: "Was any precaution adopted in order to ascertain that all the chapters of each Puráńa, or even all the subjects treated of, in it, were actually included in it?

* Collected Works, Vol. III., p. 6.

† Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.

such a manner of examining the Puráńas will never enable any person to form any but an erroneous judgment of the real nature and genuineness of their contents. Had, for instance, Professor Wilson actually read even that division of the *Brahma Vaivarta Puráńa* which is dedicated particularly, *but not exclusively*, to the life of Kŕishńa, he would have found, in it, several conversations between Kŕishńa and Rádhá, in which Kŕishńa relates, in the most orthodox manner, several legends and particulars of Hindu mythology, and instructs Rádhá in the abstruse doctrines of Hindu theology; and, even in one of those conversations, is contained a long orthodox account of Śiva, Satí, and Párvati. The ritual, also, prescribed, in it, for the celebration of Kŕishńa's annual festival, is perfectly orthodox; for it directs that, in performing it, texts of the *Sáma Veda* should be recited; besides which, three divisions of this Puráńa are dedicated to Brahmá, Deví, and Gańeśa; so that, in fact, there is not, perhaps, more than one-sixth of the whole work that is occupied with descriptions of Kŕishńa. Yet this is the work the character of which Professor Wilson pronounces to be, "in truth, so decidedly secta-

For any omission of them would, obviously, prevent an accurate opinion being formed of its contents." The indices and abstracts may be quite correct, as far as they go; but the question is, Are they full and complete? And, as it cannot be supposed that Professor Wilson has omitted, in his notices of the Puráńas, those particulars, contained in them, which were contrary to his view of the subject, these letters will sufficiently show that no precaution was adopted to render those indices and abstracts full and complete, and that omissions of essential importance have, in consequence, taken place in them.

rial," as to give it "not the slightest title to be regarded as a Puráńa."*

I shall pursue the subject in a succeeding letter.

Bombay, 30*th October*, 1840.

VANS KENNEDY.

SIR: I proceed—with reluctance, however,—to consider another of Professor Wilson's arguments, in which he infers that the present Puráńas must be modern compilations, because the Jainas are mentioned in them. But, in my last letter,† I have shown that, had Professor Wilson read the chapter of the *Kúrma Puráńa* from which he has made a mutilated quotation, he would have observed, from the context, that the term *Árhata*, contained in it, could not possibly apply to Jina; and, in the passage which he quotes from the *Bhágavata*,‡ there is neither proof nor probability that *Árhata* means either Jina or the Jaina sect.§ It is, also, expressly said, in the *Vishńu Puráńa*, Vol. III., p. 209, the Buddhists "were called Árhatas, from the phrase he (Buddha,)|| had employed, of 'Ye are worthy (Arhatha) of this great doctrine.'" It is singular, there-

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXVI. and LXVII.

† The Colonel should have written "my last letter but one". *Vide supra*, pp. 286, 287.

‡ Vol. II., p. 104, note 1. Arhat, a proper name, occurs there.

§ Árhata, according to circumstances, may denote either a follower of Buddha or a follower of Jina.

|| *Vide infra*, p. 348, text and note 1, for a lame apology for this interpolation.

fore, that Professor Wilson should assume, in direct opposition to the authority of the Puráńa which he has, himself, translated, that the term *Árhata*, when it occurs, as a proper name, in the Puráńas, should be considered to apply to Jina, and not to Buddha.* But it has been sufficiently proved that Buddha lived in *the sixth century B. C.*; and no argument, therefore, could be founded upon the mention of his name in the Puráńas, to prove that not one of the works now extant under the name of Puráńas was written prior to *the year* 900 *A. D.*; and, on that account, Professor Wilson has—too evidently, for the support of his opinion,—transferred the term *Árhata* from Buddha (to whom, alone, it is applied, in the Puráńas,) to Jina. Professor Wilson, therefore, has not yet proved that the Jainas are mentioned in the Puráńas.† But the Buddhists are frequently mentioned in those works; and it is, therefore, a strange mode of reasoning, to infer that anything contained in the Puráńas relates to Jina, when it may apply, with so much more probability, to Vishńu's incarnation, Buddha, from whom the Buddhists, according to the Puráńas, originated.

The preceding remarks, and those contained in my former letters, will evince that Professor Wilson's examination of the Puráńas has been much too incomplete, and that the conclusions which he has drawn from it are much too erroneous to authorize him to state so positively: "That Brahmans unknown to fame have remodelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and, especially, the Puráńas, cannot reasonably be con-

* *Vide infra*, p. 362, text and note §.

† This is quite a mistake. See Vol. IV., p. 43, note 1.

tested,"* and that "It is possible[1] . . that there may have been an earlier class of Puráńas, of which those we now have are but the partial and adulterated representatives."† This opinion has been maintained by Lieut. Col. Wilford and Mr. Bentley, and, in some measure, countenanced by Mr. Colebrooke; but it still remains unsupported by any proof whatever. Professor Wilson argues thus: In the vocabulary of Amara Siḿha, written 56 B. C., it is said that a Puráńa is "a treatise on five topics," and, in several of the Puráńas, it is, further, explained what these five topics are: but not one of the Puráńas now extant conforms to that definition: therefore, the present Puráńas cannot be the works which were current, under that name, in the time of Amara Siḿha. This conclusion is, further, supported by his affirming only, but not proving, that the present Puráńas inculcate the doctrines of sects of known modern origin, and that "circumstances are sometimes mentioned, or alluded to, [in the Puráńas], or references to authorities are made, or legends are narrated, or places are particularized, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable."‡

Such is the state of the question. On the first two of these points I have, perhaps, already said more than sufficient; and the only point, therefore, which re-

[1] This "it is possible" is singular; for much of Professor Wilson's reasoning depends on the fact, that the original Puráńas were current in the time of Amara Siḿha.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XCVIII., XCIX.

† *Ibid.*, p VI.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. XI.

mains to be considered is, whether there is any internal evidence, contained in the Puráńas now extant, which proves that each and all of those works are modern compilations. I cannot place so much reliance on my own examination of the Puráńas, as to affirm that there is not; but no passages containing such internal evidence have been yet produced; and, were even passages bearing a modern appearance produced, the dates of the circumstances mentioned in them could not be determined. For the Puráńas contain no dates; and there exists not any biographical, topographical, chronological, or historical work which would afford the means of fixing the date when, in India, a place of pilgrimage first acquired sacredness, when a temple was first erected, when a distinguished character lived, when a king reigned,* or when an ancient sect, philosophical or religious, was founded, or when it became extinct. All the circumstances and events mentioned in the Puráńas, from which an inference with respect to their date might be drawn, are of precisely the same kind as the temples in Orissa, from the mention of which, in the *Brahma Puráńa*, Professor Wilson infers the modern date of that work; for it is not only necessary to prove that those temples were built in modern times, but it must be, further, proved that, previous to their erection, no temples ever existed, in India, of the same names, and in the same situations. In the quotation, also, from the *Kúrma Puráńa*, contained in my second letter,† is mentioned a *Váma Sástra*; and there is, at this day, a sect

* *Vide supra*, p. 313, note *.

† *Vide supra*, pp. 286, 287.

named Váma Yamáchárin; but, as the Puráńa gives no description of the *Váma Sástra*, on what grounds can it be reasonably supposed that this is, actually, the same as the *Tantras* of the *left-handed* sect of the Śáktas? In all such cases, it is evident that coincidence merely in name is no proof that the name must necessarily apply to the modern temple or sect; and, consequently, its applicability must be proved, before a mere name can be admitted as any proof that the Puráńas are modern compilations. It is equally evident that, as the Puráńas contain no dates, and as there are no books to refer to for an illustration of their contents, so far is the recent date of any particular circumstance mentioned in them from being indisputable, that, on the contrary, every adaptation of an occurrence or event, mentioned in the Puráńas, to a date must depend solely and entirely on conjecture. No circumstances, therefore, are mentioned in the Puráńas, the precise or even approximate date of which can be indisputably fixed, or even fixed at all; and it must, hence, follow that those works do not contain any internal evidence which proves their recent composition.*

Professor Wilson's supposition, however, that the Puráńas have been remodelled by the Brahmans, rests entirely on the further supposition, that circumstances are mentioned, in those works, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable. But I have examined in vain the remarks contained in the Preface to the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, in order to ascertain

* That the Puráńas are not ancient is evident from their very Sanskrit. How, too, as regards their prophetic parts?

what the precise opinion is which Professor Wilson means to express with respect to the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráńas, as now extant. He maintains that the whole of the *Bhágavata* was written by Bopadeva; that the compilation of the *Vámana* "may have amused the leisure of some Brahman of Benares"; that the *Agni* and *Brahma Vaivarta* have no claims to be regarded as Puráńas; and that the *Linga* "is more a ritual than a Puráńa":* and he, thus, gives approximate dates to nine of the Puráńas, the dates of the other nine being nearer to, or remoter from, the earliest date mentioned:

Márkańdeya . . .	9th or 10th	century.
Linga	9th or 10th	"
Vishńu	11th or 12th	"
Padma[1]	12th — 16th	"
Varáha	12th	"
Bhágavata	12th	"
Brahma	13th or 14th	"
Vámana	14th or 15th	"
Náradíya	16th or 17th†	"

But, although Professor Wilson thus expressly ascribes the original composition of two of the Puráńas to two individuals, and seems to intimate that several of the other Puráńas were composed in the same manner, he

[1] Professor Wilson remarks that the different portions of this Puráńa "are, in all probability, as many different works"; and the above dates, therefore, apply to different portions of the whole work.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. L., LXXVI., LX., LXVII., LXIX.

† *Ibid.*, pp. LVIII., LXX., CXI., XXXIV., LXXI., LI., XXIX., LXXVI., LIII.

yet seems to suppose that the groundwork of the present Puráńas was the eighteen ancient Puráńas; for he speaks of "the strong internal evidence, which all of them afford, of the intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients."* He even remarks that "the identity of the legends in many of them [the Puráńas], and, still more, the identity of the words,—for, in several of them, long passages are, literally, the same,†—is a sufficient proof that..... they must be copied either from some other similar work, or from a common and prior original."‡ To argue against such inconsistencies and contradictions is quite out of the question; but it is evident that, if the composition and compilation of the present Puráńas by eighteen different persons occupied eight centuries, those works could not also have been remodelled by the Brahmans, for sectarian purposes; and that, if their groundwork was the ancient Puráńas, not one of them could be the original composition of a modern writer; and that, if such was not their groundwork, it is utterly incredible that eighteen different persons, living at long intervals of time from each other, and while the Muhammadans were extending their dominions over the greatest part of India, should produce eighteen works in which the legends are identical, and long passages are, literally, the same. The supposition, also, that an aggregate of 1.600.000 lines, spread over an extent of a million of square miles, should have been remodelled, whether by the Brahmans or any

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.

† This is, I believe, greatly an overstatement. It is a rare thing, at least in my experience, to find even a single couplet precisely the same in any two Puráńas. See Vol. I., p. 57, note *.

‡ Vol. I., Preface, p. VI.

other persons, on one uniform plan, seems to be an absolute impossibility; and the motive assigned for such remodelling,—sectarial imposture,—is at once disproved by the simple facts, that not one of the Puráńas inculcates sectarian doctrines, and that the *exclusive* worshippers of Vishńu, or of Śiva, or of any other deity, have always formed, in India, but a small portion of the whole population.

There is, however, a difficulty which embarrasses the decision of this question; for, not only in several of the Puráńas are the names of all the eighteen specified, but, in most of them, the narrator is requested to repeat the Puráńa about to be related, expressly by name. Professor Wilson, therefore, correctly remarks that "the identity of the legends in many of them [the Puráńas], and, still more, the identity of the words,—for, in several of them, long passages are, literally, the same, —is a sufficient proof that, in all such cases, they must be copied either from some other similar work, or from a common and prior original." The internal evidence, however, of the Puráńas fully proves that they have not been copied from each other; and this identity, therefore, must have been derived from one common original. But there is nothing improbable in supposing that, previous to the Puráńas being committed to writing in their present state, *four or five centuries prior to the Christian era*, numerous legends and traditions relating to the modes of worship and the doctrines of the Hindu religion had, in remote times, been formed, preserved, and transmitted by oral communication only.[1] When, therefore, eighteen different per-

[1] Such is the manner in which instruction is communicated

sons, in different parts of India, collected together those legends and traditions, and committed them to writing, the greatest similarity would, necessarily, exist in the eighteen works, and the same legend and tradition would often be selected for insertion, and, consequently, often expressed in the same, or nearly the same, words. The existence, therefore, of "a common and prior original", so far from being an argument against the genuineness and antiquity of the present Puráńas, should, on the contrary, be considered as a decisive proof that those works are, essentially, in the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing. Because, in their present state, each of the Puráńas is a collection of legends, traditions, and rituals, and not a work systematically written; and it must, hence, be evident that such collections could have been made only at a time when such traditionary lore was fresh in the memory of the Brahmans. The present state, therefore, of the Puráńas now extant, in which the most important legends, and even the origin of the deities, are related in a discordant manner,—though not in such a manner as in the least affects the perfect homogeneity of the Hindu religion,—is, alone, a strong proof that those works have undergone no

---

amongst the Brahmans, even at this day; and it is an immemorial tradition, that the Puráńas were thus transmitted. In the *Vishńu Puráńa*, for instance, Paráśara thus replies to Maitreya: "Now truly all that was told me formerly by Vasishtha, and by the wise Pulastya" . . . . "I will relate to you the whole, even all you have asked."*

---

* Vol. I., p. 11.

alteration since they were first committed to writing: for, as those discordancies have been allowed to remain, it is most probable that religious scruples have prevented the Brahmans from subsequently giving uniformity to their religious system.

But, to the supposition, that the present Puráńas are modern compilations, written between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, the existence of "a common and prior original" becomes an insuperable objection; for it is highly improbable that such legends and traditions as are contained in the Puráńas were then current; and, even admitting that they were, it is quite incredible that, in the disturbed state of India, and decay of Sanskrit learning, during that period, eighteen different persons should produce eighteen works in which not only the legends are identical, but long passages literally the same. It may, however, be said that the eighteen ancient Puráńas were then extant, or, at least, that fragments of them were still preserved. I shall not here repeat what I have already said respecting the incredibility of the suppositions that the Brahmans have suppressed the ancient Puráńas, and substituted, in their place, the works now bearing that name, or that the Brahmans of all India have received, in the place of the ancient Puráńas, the acknowledged works of eighteen obscure individuals. On this point, also, it is impossible to ascertain what the opinion of Professor Wilson is: for, in one part of that Preface, he appears to admit, distinctly, that each of the ancient Puráńas was extant until it was superseded by the present Puráńa; but, in other parts, he has argued at length, to prove that the present Purá-

ńas cannot be the same works which were current in the time of Amara Siḿha. Since, therefore, Professor Wilson has, thus, adopted two contradictory suppositions, in order to account for what he supposes to be the spuriousness of the present Puráńas, it must be evident that he has completely failed in proving that the present Puráńas are not genuine. But the levity and irreflection with which Professor Wilson has decided against the genuineness and antiquity of those works will be best judged of from these remarks: "No weight can be attached to the specification of the eighteen names; for they are, always, complete: each Puráńa enumerates all. Which is the last? Which had the opportunity of naming its seventeen predecessors, and adding itself? The argument proves too much. There can be little doubt that the list has been inserted, upon the authority of tradition, either by some improving transcriber, or by the compiler of a work more recent than the eighteen genuine Puráńas."[1]* Professor Wilson extends the compilation of the present

[1] Professor Wilson observes that the objection to the modern composition of the *Śrí Bhágavata* is rebutted by there being another Puráńa to which the name applies,—the *Deví Bhágavata.* But all his remarks on this point are entirely misplaced and unnecessary; because the mere perusal of the *Deví Bhágavata* † will at once show that it is, decidedly and avowedly, a Tántrika work: for, in the 26th chapter of the 3rd *skandha*, is contained a description of the *Kumári-pújá*, or worship of the virgin. I possess a copy of this work, in twelve *skandhas*, which appears to be complete.

What, also, does Professor Wilson here mean by *genuine* Puráńas? He denies that the Puráńas current in the time of Amara

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XLV. † *Ibid.*, p. LXXXVIII., note †.

Puráńas over eight centuries; and, therefore, in order to get rid of the objection to this supposition, which results from each Puráńa containing the names of all the eighteen, he thinks it quite sufficient to observe that this specification has been inserted by some improving transcriber,—he must mean, of course, after the last of the present Puráńas was written, that is, after the seventeenth century. Thus, supposition is supported by supposition; and, thus, all Professor Wilson's reasoning, to prove that the present Puráńas are modern compilations, depends entirely on gratuitous assumptions and groundless assertions.

Whether, however, complete works, bearing the same names, existed previous to the present Puráńas being committed to writing, is a question which admits not of decision. That the names of all the eighteen Puráńas were previously known seems unquestionable;* and it would, therefore, appear most probable that these names had belonged to works which had preceded the present Puráńas. But the internal evidence of the present Puráńas proves that they are, rather, collections of legends, traditions, and rituals, than works systematically written; for they are entirely deficient in arrangement, and the subjects treated of in them have

Siḿha are now extant; but he has not attempted to explain how long it was that they continued current after that time, nor the time and manner in which they subsequently became extinct; and yet, in discussing a point relating to the present Puráńas, he seems to speak of them as if they were the genuine Puráńas. To elicit, therefore, either meaning or consistency out of such remarks is, evidently, quite impossible.

* What proof is there of this assertion?

no further connexion with each other than that they all contribute to inculcate and illustrate some of the tenets and doctrines of the Hindu religion. It is possible, however, that more ancient Puráńas may have existed, which, from various circumstances during their transmission by oral communication only, were no longer in a complete state, when the present Puráńas were committed to writing; and that such fragments of them as were at that time preserved have been incorporated in the present Puráńas, to which, also, the names of the ancient works have been given. But the decision of this question is of no importance; because it is proved that works bearing the names of the Puráńas were current in India in the century prior to the Christian era;* and there is not the slightest reason for supposing that those works have not been preserved until the present day, in the same manner as other Sanskrit manuscripts of the same period have been preserved. From the notices, also, which occur in Greek writers, it appears highly probable that the very same system of religion which is described in the Puráńas prevailed in India at the time of Alexander's invasion; and it may, therefore, be justly concluded that the Puráńas had received their present form† four or five centuries prior to the Christian era. Even Professor Wilson remarks: "But the same internal testimony furnishes proof, equally decisive, of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of the Puráńas, in the face of abundant posi-

* This has never been proved. † As to their predictions and all?

tive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era."* But it must be evident that these remarks are totally irreconcileable with what Professor Wilson elsewhere observes: "At the same time, they [the Puráńas,] may be acquitted of subservience to any but sectarial imposture. They were pious frauds for temporary purposes."†

It, hence, clearly appears that, in contending for the modern compilation of the present Puráńas, Professor Wilson was influenced by a preconceived opinion, the erroneousness of which he would not admit; but that, in thus forcibly maintaining the antiquity of the greater portion of the contents of those works, he was irresistibly compelled to yield to the convincing proof, which their internal evidence presents, of the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráńas, as now extant. I have, also, sufficiently shown, in these letters, that the present Puráńas do neither inculcate sectarian doctrines nor indicate, in any manner, that they are an intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients; but that, on the contrary, they exhibit, throughout an aggregate of 1.600.000 lines, the utmost uniformity in the general description of legends, traditions, modes of worship, and doctrines.‡ It must, consequently, be most reasonable to conclude that the Puráńas now extant received their present form four or five centuries prior to the Christian era, and that, since then,

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX. † *Ibid.*, p. XI.

‡ One is at a loss to see where all this has been shown.

they have undergone no alteration whatever; rather than that they are works which, for the purpose of sectarial imposture, either have been remodelled by the Brahmans since the Christian era, or which have been written by eighteen obscure individuals, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries.

Bombay, 30*th October*, 1840.

VANS KENNEDY.

SIR: As the eighteen Puráńas are, undoubtedly, the only source from which a knowledge of the mythology and popular religion of the Hindus can be derived, it becomes of importance to determine whether those works are ancient compositions, or mere modern compilations; and I trust, in consequence, that you will have no objection to my offering a few further remarks on this subject, previous to closing its discussion. In my last letter, however, I observed that the Puráńas contain no dates, and that there is no biographical, topographical, geographical, or historical work which would afford the means of fixing the date when, in India, a place of pilgrimage first acquired sacredness, when a temple was first erected, when a king or distinguished personage lived,* or when a philosophical or religious sect was founded, or when it became extinct. It would, hence, seem that, as the date of the circumstances mentioned in the Puráńas cannot be determined, the question whether they are ancient or

* *Vide supra*, p. 313, note *.

modern cannot be decided; as all opinions respecting the period when they may have been written must depend, principally, if not entirely, on conjecture. But the internal evidence of those works affords the strongest proof that they cannot be modern compilations; for the legends, and descriptions of scenery, and of men and manners, contained in them, bear such an unquestionable impression of antiquity, and such a dissimilarity to all that is known of India since the era of Vikramáditya (B. C. 56),* that they irresistibly lead to the conclusion that the Puráńas must have been written at some remote period. When, therefore, the Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford published his opinion, that the works now bearing that name were compiled between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, it might have been expected that he would have supported so startling a statement by the clearest and most conclusive arguments and authorities. But he has, on the contrary,—as I have, perhaps sufficiently shown,—formed that opinion from an imperfect examination of the Puráńas, and maintained it solely by having recourse to gratuitous assumptions and groundless assertions.

The whole, indeed, of the remarks contained in the Preface to the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa* appear to have been written for the purpose of demonstrating that, "of the present popular forms of the Hindu religion, none assumed their actual state earlier than the time of Śankara Ácharya, the great Śaiva

* In p. 312, *supra*, Colonel Kennedy pronounces that "The history of India during the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era is almost unknown." Also see p. 293, *supra*.

reformer, who, flourished, in all likelihood, in the eighth or ninth century. Of the Vaishńava teachers, Rámánuja dates in the twelfth century; Madhwácharya, in the thirteenth; and Vallabha, in the sixteenth; and the Puráńas seem to have accompanied, or followed, their innovations; being obviously intended to advocate the doctrines they taught."* A still more erroneous opinion was published by Professor Wilson, twelve years before, in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," in which he has observed: "To the internal incongruities of the system, which did not affect its integral existence, others were, in time, superadded, that threatened to dissolve or destroy the whole. Of this nature was the exclusive adoration of the old deities, or of new forms of them; and even, it may be presumed, the introduction of new divinities. In all these respects, the Puráńas and Tantras were especially instrumental; and they not only taught their followers to assert the unapproachable superiority of the gods they worshipped, but inspired them with feelings of animosity towards those who presumed to dispute that supremacy. In this conflict, the worship of Brahmá has disappeared, as well as, indeed, that of the whole pantheon, except Vishńu, Śiva, and Śakti, or their modifications. With respect to the two former, in fact, the representatives have borne away the palm from the prototypes; and Kŕishńa, Ráma, or the Linga, are almost the only forms under which Vishńu and Śiva are now adored in most parts of† India."‡ In

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.

† Colonel Kennedy here omitted the very important words "most parts of".

‡ Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 3—5.

this Sketch, however, Professor Wilson at the same time observes that "the worshippers of Vishńu, Śiva, and Śakti, who are the objects of the following description, are not to be confounded with the orthodox adorers of those divinities."* And yet he also states that *the present state of the Hindu faith is of, comparatively, very recent origin.*[1]†

It would, hence, appear that Professor Wilson has formed his opinion of the Hindu religion from the *exception*, and not from the *rule*, and that he has given an importance to the sects that have originated amongst upwards of a hundred and thirty millions of people, to which they are not entitled. For it would, no doubt, be considered as a strange mode of judging of the established religion of England, were an opinion to be formed of it from the sects which prevail there: but such seems to have been the manner in which Professor Wilson has contemplated the Hindu religion; and it is too evident that it is in support of this erroneous view of the subject that he has ascribed to the Puráńas a modern origin, and contents which they do not contain. But I am certain that not a single Puráńa inculcates the *exclusive* worship of a particular deity, and that not a passage which is genuine can be found, in any Puráńa,‡ which would inspire the followers of

[1] This Sketch is contained in Vols. XVI. and XVII. of the *Asiatic Researches*. I refer, throughout this letter, to the part contained in Vol. XVI.

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., p. 30. † *Ibid.*, p. 12.

‡ In p. 347, *infra*, Colonel Kennedy asserts, however, that "there are no means of distinguishing those parts of them [the Puráńas,] which

one deity with feelings of animosity towards those who presumed to dispute its supremacy.[1] So far, indeed, is this from being the case, that every sect—as Professor Wilson himself admits,—has found it necessary to compose works for the purpose of teaching and supporting its peculiar tenets; which circumstance, alone, is sufficient to prove that the Puráńas were not adapted for the promotion of such an object, and, consequently, that those works could not have been written in subservience to sectarial imposture, as Professor Wilson supposes.

It is also undeniable that the great mass of the Hindus are Smártas, though all who are so do not adopt this name;[2] that is, they consider both Vishńu

[1] In the Sketch referred to, Professor Wilson has quoted several Sanskrit authorities, which, if genuine, would disprove this statement: but he has specified neither the book nor the chapter of the Puráńas from which they are said to be taken; and it would appear that he had not, himself, verified them. Not being able, therefore, to ascertain this point, I must consider* these quotations to be spurious; for they are at complete variance with numerous passages that occur in the Puráńas, which expressly inculcate that Vishńu and Śiva ought, both, to be worshipped.

[2] The Brahmans of the Deccan, for instance, and of Gujerat, call themselves Śaivas; but they are, in reality, Smártas, as they do not reject the worship of Vishńu, though they consider it of less importance than that of Śiva. The same is the case with many of the Brahmans in other parts of India, who call themselves Vaishńavas, but consider Śiva as entitled to adoration. This, however, is in strict conformity to the Puráńas, in which

are thought to be ancient and genuine from those which are thought to be modern and spurious."

* Most venturesomely.

and Śiva to be entitled to adoration, but some of them identify either Vishńu or Śiva with the Supreme Being,—an opinion which is clearly inculcated in several of the Puráńas. But, though, in some of those works, Vishńu is represented to be, in some degree, inferior to Śiva, still the latter is frequently introduced, in the Śaiva Puráńas, as enjoining the necessity of worshipping Vishńu, and explaining the mysterious nature of his incarnations; and, in the same manner, though, in the Vaishńava Puráńas, the supremacy is ascribed to Vishńu, still the fullest justice is done to the divinity of Śiva. The *exclusive* votary of Vishńu, on the contrary, refuses all adoration to Śiva; and, in the same manner, the *exclusive* votary of Śiva denies Vishńu to be a proper object of worship; and such votaries, therefore, of these deities are, with reference to the population, by no means numerous in India. It is equally unquestionable that the substitution of the Linga for the image of Śiva occasioned no alteration in the worship of that god; for, in the ritual prescribed for the worship of the Linga, as contained in the *Linga Puráńa*, it is said: "Having bathed in the prescribed manner, enter the place of worship; and, having performed three suppressions of the breath, meditate on that god (Śiva,) who has three eyes, five heads, ten arms, and is of the colour of pure crystal, arrayed in costly garments, and adorned with all kinds of ornaments. Thus, having fixed in thy mind the real form of Maheśwara, proceed to worship him with the proper hymns and prayers." The Linga, therefore, is

the terms Vaishńava and Śaiva denote the *preferential*, but not the *exclusive*, worshipper of either Vishńu or Śiva.

worshipped by all Śaivas and Smártas; for it is, in fact, the only type under which Śiva has been adored from remote times. The worship, also, of Ráma is scarcely known in India;* and Professor Wilson is, certainly, incorrect in stating that the worship of Bála Gopála, the infant Kŕishńa, is very widely diffused amongst all ranks of Indian society; for the votaries of Kŕishńa are by no means numerous, and are to be found only in Bengal,[1] and in some parts of Hindostan proper.

Much of the reasoning, however, adduced in the Preface to the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, to prove the modern compilation of the Puráńas, is founded on the supposition that the date of the Puráńas in which Kŕishńa is mentioned—particularly the *Brahma Vaivarta*,—must be subsequent to the establishment of the sect of "the worshippers of the juvenile Kŕishńa and Rádhá, a form of belief of known modern origin."† But, in that Preface, Professor Wilson gives it, as his opinion, that the Mahábhárata "is, evidently, the great fountain from which most, if not all, of the Puráńas have drawn;"‡ and, in the Sketch above referred to,§ he remarks: "The worship of Kŕishńa, as one with Vishńu and the universe, dates,

---

[1] Mr. Ward remarks: "Six parts out of ten of the whole Hindu population of Bengal are supposed to be disciples of this god. The far greater part of these, however, are of the lower orders; and but few of them Brahmans." Vol. I., p. 200.

---

* If Colonel Kennedy's information had been coextensive with anything approaching the whole of India, he would never have hazarded this remark.

† Vol. I., Preface, p. LXVI. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. XCII.

§ Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., p. 121.

evidently, from the Mahábhárata." According to this statement, therefore, it is evident that, as the worship of Kŕishńa dates from that poem, and as its composition preceded that of the Puráńas, the date of none of those works can in the least depend on the time when the sects of Vallabha and Chaitanya originated,—unless, indeed, Professor Wilson supposes that the *Mahábhárata* was not written until after the year 1520, A. D. In that Sketch, also, Professor Wilson has observed: "The worship of Kŕishńa, as one with Vishńu and the universe, dates, evidently, from the Mahábhárata; and his more juvenile forms [actions?] are brought pre-eminently to notice in the account of his infancy contained in the Bhágavata: but neither of these works discriminates him from Vishńu; nor do they recommend his infantine and adolescent state to particular veneration." And, further: "In this description of creation, however, the deity [Kŕishńa,] is still spoken of as a young man; and the Puráńa [the *Brahma Vaivarta*], therefore, affords only indirect authority, in the marvels it narrates of his infancy, for the worship of the child."* These remarks are quite correct, as far as relates to the veneration of Kŕishńa; for I have shown, in my former letters, that in not one of the Puráńas is the worship of Kŕishńa, either as a child or a young man, inculcated, or even indicated. It is, hence, evident that, although the accounts of Kŕishńa's boyhood, which are contained in several of the Puráńas, may have suggested to Vallabha and Chaitanya the design of establishing the worship of Kŕishńa, still those Puráńas could not have been written

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., p. 121 and p. 124.

for the purpose of promoting a form of belief which is not even mentioned in them.

Professor Wilson, at the same time, extends the prevalence of this worship, by identifying the infant Kŕishńa with "the juvenile master of the universe, Jagannátha";* and yet he fixes the date when the temple of Jagannátha was erected, in A. D. 1198,† and that when Vallabha lived, in about A. D. 1520.‡ The worship, therefore, of Jagannátha cannot be the same as that of Kŕishńa established by Vallabha; and, in fact, there is not the slightest resemblance between them: because Jagannátha is worshipped as an incarnate form, or, rather, as a type, of Vishńu, by all Hindus; and, on the contrary, the worship of Kŕishńa is not generally practised, and prevails only in particular parts of India. The legend, also, relating to Jagannátha has no further reference to Kŕishńa than the name; for it is said, in it, that the temple of Purushottama was erected by a king named Indradyumna, a fervent votary of Vishńu, who being much distressed for the want of a proper image to place in it, Vishńu appeared to him, in a dream, and informed him that, the next morning, he would find, in the sea, a sacred tree from which the image was to be made. In the *Brahma Puráńa*, it is, further, said that, when the king had, accordingly, found the tree, and brought it on shore, Vishńu and Viśwakarman (the artificer of the gods) appeared to him, and that Vishńu directed the latter to form from the tree the images of Kŕishńa, his brother Balabhadra, and sister Subadhrá, which command

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XXII. † *Vide supra*, p. 312.

‡ Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., p. 120.

Viśwakarman immediately executed. Although, therefore, the images worshipped at Jagannátha bear these names, the adoration is, in reality, addressed to Vishńu, as the lord of the universe; and, consequently, in the ritual prescribed for it, there is no mention whatever of "the infant Kŕishńa, Govinda, Bála Gopála, the sojourner in Vŕindávana, the companion of the cowherds and milkmaids, the lover of Rádhá."*

Professor Wilson also seems not to have taken into consideration that the ten *avatáras* of Vishńu are an essential part of the Hindu religion; as it appears to be sufficiently ascertained that they are alluded to in the Vedas,† and it is certain that the son of Devakí, or Kŕishńa, is mentioned in at least two of the Upanishads—the *Chhándogya* and *Náráyańa*. The veneration, therefore, of Kŕishńa, as an incarnate form of Vishńu, which is all that is prescribed in the Puráńas, must be of as remote a date as the most ancient known state of the Hindu religion;‡ and the mention, consequently, of Kŕishńa, in any of the Puráńas, as an *avatára* of Vishńu, but not as a peculiar object of worship,—in which character he is never described in those works,§—can afford no grounds for supposing that the present Puráńas are modern and sectarian compilations. Before, therefore, Professor Wilson identified that veneration with the worship of Kŕishńa established by Vallabha and Chaitanya, and hence inferred the

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XXII.

† The knowledge of this allusion seems to be the peculiar property of Colonel Kennedy.

‡ That is to say, as old as the *mantras* of the *Ŕigveda*!

§ For disproof of this assertion, see Book V of this Work, *passim*.

comparatively recent date of the Puráńas, as now extant, he should have produced, from those works, some passages which either expressly or virtually inculcate that worship; but he himself acknowledges, as I have before observed, that no such passages exist, and thus admits that this objection to the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráńas rests, solely and entirely, on inferences drawn from suppositions imagined by himself, but which are supported by neither probability nor by any authority whatever.

It is, hence, evident that, in presenting the sects which exist in India as a correct representation of the actual condition of the Hindu religion, and in maintaining that the present state of the Hindu faith "is of, comparatively, very recent origin,"* Professor Wilson has taken a most erroneous view of the subject. For the great mass of the Hindus adhere to that religious system which has prevailed in India from the remotest times, and which, alone, is inculcated in the eighteen Puráńas. Even Professor Wilson himself has observed that "the origin and development of their doctrines, traditions, and institutions [of which that system is composed,] were not the work of a day; and the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity carries it back to a much more remote antiquity, to an antiquity that is, probably, not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions, or beliefs of the ancient world."† As, however, it is only from the Puráńas that a complete knowledge of those traditions and doctrines can be

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., p. 12.

† Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.

derived, it is obvious that there are either no grounds for ascribing to them a remote antiquity, or that it must be admitted that the Puráńas are ancient compositions, and not modern compilations written by eighteen obscure individuals between the eighth and seventeenth centuries: because there are no other works with which the legends, and descriptions of scenery, men, and manners, and of rites, ceremonies, and modes of worship, contained in the Puráńas, might be compared, in order to ascertain whether they are of ancient or of modern date. And the supposing, consequently, with Professor Wilson, that the Puráńas are an intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients, can be of no avail; for there are no means of distinguishing those parts of them which are thought to be ancient and genuine from those which are thought to be modern and spurious. But the internal evidence of the Puráńas proves that those works did not accompany, or follow, the innovations introduced into the Hindu religion by Śankara Áchárya, Rámánuja, Madhwácharya, and Vallabha; and that they are not intended to advocate the doctrines taught by those sectaries. For not one of their sects is mentioned, or alluded to, in the Puráńas, in which works the only deities who are represented to be objects of worship are Vishńu, Śiva, Deví, Gańeśa, and Súrya; and the worshippers of these deities are, indisputably, held to be the five orthodox divisions of the Hindus. Professor Wilson's supposition, therefore, that the Puráńas were written in subservience to sectarial imposture, being, thus, disproved, it follows that the whole of his reasoning, to prove their modern date, founded on their

"exhibiting a sectarial fervour and exclusiveness,"* is totally futile and fallacious.

The Puráńas, consequently, do not contain—as Professor Wilson states,—the doctrines of sects of known modern origin; as, besides the sects just referred to, he only particularizes, in the Preface to the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, the Śáktas and Jainas as being mentioned in the Puráńas. But, in my former letters, I have sufficiently shown that the tenets and practices of the Śáktas are so completely at variance with every principle of the Hindu religion, that it is impossible that they could be noticed in books which the Hindus hold to be sacred. I also pointed out, in my last letter,† that the term *Árhata* did not—as Professor Wilson assumed,—indicate either Jina or the Jainas; but I stated, erroneously, that it applied, in the passage which I quoted, to Buddha.[1]‡ On subsequently comparing, however, the eighteenth chapter of Book III. of the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa* with the original, I found that the one did not agree with the other; for the terms "Bauddhas" and "Jainas", which are introduced into the Translation and the notes to it, *do not occur in the origi-*

[1] This mistake was occasioned by my trusting to the Translation, in which it is said: "These Daityas were induced, by the arch-deceiver, to deviate from their religious duties (and become Bauddhas)."

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.

† *Vide supra*, pp. 322, 323.

‡ The whole truth is, that the Colonel not only criticized Professor Wilson's rendering without reference to the original, but that he interpolated it without acknowledgement, in foisting in the word "Buddha", so distinguished, typographically, that it seems to be quoted. The excuse offered in note 1, above, is very feeble.

nal. It is, therefore, singular that Professor Wilson should have made such a translation as this: "The delusions of the false teacher paused not with the conversion of the Daityas to the Jaina and Bauddha heresies;"* and that he should have remarked, in a note: "We have, therefore, the Bauddhas noticed as a distinct sect:" because the original is, simply: "O Maitreya, after Máyámoha, the great deceiver, had deluded the Daityas by various heretical doctrines, they relinquished the excellent faith inculcated by the Veda and Smŕiti."[1] It even appears, from the whole of this legend, that it does not apply to Vishńu's appearance as Buddha, but to some other occurrence, which is not mentioned in any other Puráńa than the *Vishńu*;† for it thus commences, according to the translation:‡ "There was, formerly, a battle between the gods and demons, for the period of a divine year, in which the gods were defeated by the demons under the command of Hráda." But the only dissemination of heretical doctrines, through the instrumentality of Vishńu, which is mentioned in any other Puráńa, is that in the city of the Tripura Asuras and that in Káśí; to neither of which this legend applies; as it is said, in it, that Máyámoha, the name of the illusory being emitted from Vishńu's body, "having proceeded (to earth), beheld the Daityas,

[1] मैत्रेय तत्यजुर्धर्मं वेदस्मृत्युदितं परम् ॥
अन्यान्यप्यन्यपाखण्डप्रकारैर्बहुभिर्द्विज ।
दैतेयान्मोहयामास मायामोहोऽतिमोहकृत् ॥

* Vol. III., p. 211. Colonel Kennedy quotes only a portion of the sentence corresponding to his own translation given just below.

† For refutation of this, *vide infra*, p. 378, note †.

‡ Vol. III., p. 201.

engaged in ascetic penances, upon the banks of the Narmadá river."* Professor Wilson, therefore, has given to this chapter an interpretation not authorized by the original, in which nothing occurs which indicates that the composer of this Puráńa intended to describe either Buddha or Jina, under this illusory form, or to adopt, or allude to, their doctrines, in the words spoken by it.†

I have adverted to this remarkable deviation from the faithful manner in which translations should always be made,‡ because the purport of this legend clearly shows that the terms "Jainas" and "Bauddhas" cannot be contained in any manuscript of the *Vishńu Puráńa.* But Professor Wilson may have supposed that the term *Árhata* denoted the Jainas, and may have understood, from the words *budhyadhwam* and *budhyate,*§ that they applied to the Buddhists; and to this there could be no objection, had he expressed his opinion in a note, and not introduced into the text, the title of the chapter, and the index, the term "Jainas" and "Bauddhas". As, also, the illusory form addressed

---

* Vol. III., p. 207.

† On the contrary, it is beyond doubt that both Jina and Buddha, by implication, are represented as forms of Máyámoha. First, in the *Vishńu-puráńa,* we have mention of the establishment of the Árhatas by this "Deluder by illusion", who then metamorphoses himself, and establishes a sect by which the Bauddha is, unmistakeably, intended. The Árhatas must be either Jainas or Bauddhas; and the Chapter referred to shows that they were, unquestionably, the former. But I have anticipated Professor Wilson's Reply.

‡ The Colonel, practically, was scarcely so austerely punctilious as his principles. *Vide supra,* p. 348, note ‡.

§ On the gross error here accepted, *vide infra,* p. 362, note †, and p. 377, note ‡.

only the same Daityas,* it is evident that he could not have induced them to adopt the doctrines of both Jina and Buddha; and Professor Wilson, therefore, should have selected either the one or the other as being the false teacher here intended. But it is undeniable that Jina or the Jainas are not mentioned, in the Puráńas, under these names;† and there is no reason, as I have before shown, for supposing that they are denoted by the term *Árhata*;‡ as no conclusion can be justly drawn from an isolated word which occurs in the Puráńas, unaccompanied by any explanation of its intent and meaning. It will, hence, appear that this legend cannot apply to the Jainas: nor can it apply to Buddha; for he, according to the Vaishńava Puráńas, was not an illusory form emitted from the body of Vishńu, but an actual incarnation of Vishńu,§ born in Kíkaťa.|| When, therefore, Professor Wilson has so misunderstood and misinterpreted a passage in a Puráńa which he has himself translated, it must be evident that no reliance can be placed on the correctness of the opinions which he expresses with respect to the age, and the scope and tendency, of the eighteen Puráńas. He has, however, intimated that he intends laying before the Royal Asiatic Society analyses of all the Puráńas, similar to the one of the *Brahma Puráńa*, published in No. IX. of the *Journal* of that Society. But it is obvious that

* Not those already perverted, but "others of the same family". See Vol. III., p. 210.

† For Pauráńik mention of the *Jina-dharma*, or "religion of Jina", see Vol. IV., p. 43, note 1.

‡ Who are the Árhatas, then?

§ But why assume that the Puráńas may not contradict each other?

|| *Vide supra*, p. 178, notes 1 and ¶.

such mere details of the contents of each Puráńa can afford no information respecting the variety of subjects treated of in those works; and it is certain that, if these details are accompanied with such comments as have been already published by Professor Wilson, the analyses will convey the most erroneous notions of what is actually contained in the Puráńas. For Professor Wilson supposes that the Puráńas exhibit "a sectarial fervour and exclusiveness"; that they contain the doctrines, or allusions to the doctrines, of philosophical and religious sects of known modern origin; and that, in them, circumstances are mentioned, or alluded to, or legends are narrated, or places are particularized, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable. But no one of these suppositions—as I have evinced, in the course of these letters,—rests on any grounds whatever; and nothing contained in the Puráńas in any manner justifies Professor Wilson's opinion, that those works are pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, and in subservience to sectarial imposture. As, however, he not only entertains such an opinion, but even supposes that the Puráńas were compiled by eighteen obscure individuals, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, it will be evident that no analyses which Professor Wilson may give of those works will convey a correct, complete, and impartial account of the traditions, doctrines, and modes of worship which are described in the eighteen Puráńas.

In the remarks, therefore, contained in these letters, my object has been to evince that Professor Wilson has taken a most erroneous view of the remote and

actual state of the Hindu religion, and that his preconceived opinions on this subject have led him to assign a modern origin to the Puráńas, and to support this statement by ascribing to them sectarian doctrines which they, certainly, do not contain; and that all his reasoning to prove the modern compilation of those works is futile, contradictory, unfounded, or improbable. In this I have, perhaps, succeeded; for, as Professor Wilson has not quoted any passages from the Puráńas, in which sectarial fervour and exclusiveness are exhibited,* and in which circumstances of comparatively recent date are mentioned,† it may be concluded that he knew of no such passages; as their production would, at once, have proved the point which he wished to establish. This negative argument acquires the greater force from Professor Wilson having stated that he has collected a voluminous series of indices, abstracts, and translations of all the Puráńas; and, consequently, if any passages occur, in them, which inculcate the *exclusive* worship of Vishńu or Śiva, or the worship of Ráma, Kŕishńa, or Śakti, or which mention the Jainas,‡ or any modern sect, or any comparatively recent event, he could have had no difficulty in producing such passages, in support of his statements; and their non-production, therefore, must be considered as strong proof of their non-existence. The supposition, however, that the Puráńas were written in subservience to sectarial imposture, was judiciously selected, by Professor Wilson, as his principal argument in proof of

---

* *Vide supra*, p. 340, notes 1 and *.

† Professor Wilson does refer to the prophetic parts of the Puráńas. See Vol. I., Preface, pp. XVI. and XVII. ‡ *Vide supra*, p. 323, note †.

their modern compilation; for the internal evidence of the genuineness and antiquity of those works depends entirely on their exhibiting a faithful representation of the Hindu religion as it existed in remote times. But Professor Wilson has not yet proved that the Puráńas contain sectarian doctrines; and I am convinced that, when the Puráńas are more fully examined, and the Vedas more completely known, it will be ascertained that the rites, ceremonies, and doctrines of the Hindu religion, described in the Puráńas, are, essentially, the same as those described in the Vedas, and that no essential difference exists between the ritual of the Vedas and the modes of worship prescribed in the Puráńas, except the adoration of images; and I can affirm, from actual perusal, that the theological parts of the Puráńas conform, in every respect, to the doctrines which are contained in the principal Upanishads; and these, it is admitted, are portions of the Vedas.*

With regard, however, to the legends which occur in the Puráńas, I may be allowed to avail myself of the following remarks which I have made in another work: "'*I observe, however* (Mr. Colebrooke remarks), *in many places* [of the Vedas], *the groundwork of legends which are familiar in mythological poems: such, for example, as the demon Vŕitra, slain by Indra, who is, thence, named Vŕitrahan; but I do not remark anything that corresponds with the favourite legends of those sects which worship either the Linga or Śakti,*

---

* The multiplied errors of this passage it must be unnecessary, at this day, to point out. The writers of the Puráńas paid little intelligent heed to the Vedas, of which, for the rest, the Upanishads cannot, with any propriety, be considered as portions.

or else Ráma or Kŕishńa. I except some detached portions the genuineness of which appears doubtful; as will be shown towards the close of this Essay.' * But, instead of considering the allusions to popular mythology which occur in the Vedas as being the *groundwork* of subsequent legends, would it not be more consonant with reason and probability to conclude that these allusions actually referred to well-known legends? For, otherwise, it will be evident that they must have been altogether unintelligible,—expressed, as they were, with so much brevity, and, in fact, merely mentioned in that cursory manner which is usual in adverting to circumstances perfectly notorious. In which case, it would also appear most likely that the legends had been previously collected, and rendered accessible to every one by being recorded in those very works which are still extant under the name of Puráńas; for it is quite impossible to discover, in the Puráńas, a single circumstance which has the remotest semblance to the deification of heroes, a notion totally unknown to the Hindus."[1] †

It, hence, appears that there is an intimate correspondence between the legends, rites, ceremonies, and doctrines described in the Vedas and Puráńas; and even Professor Wilson admits that there is "abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence

[1] Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Ancient and Hindu Mythology, p. 188.

* Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., p. 28, note *. Colebrooke does not italicize this passage.

† Here, again, Colonel Kennedy has come to a conclusion widely different from that ordinarily entertained.

of the doctrines which they [the Puráńas,] teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era;"* and that "the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity carries it back to a much more remote antiquity."† But it is evident that such a correspondence with the Vedas, and with the ancient state of the Hindu religion, could not exist in the Puráńas, unless they were written at a period when the traditions, the ritual, and the doctrines of the Vedas still constituted the prevailing form of the Hindu religion; and it is, therefore, utterly improbable that (as Professor Wilson supposes,) the Puráńas, as now extant, could have been compiled between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, when the Muhammadans were extending their dominion over the greatest part of India, and when the Hindu religion had lost much of its original purity. His reasoning, consequently, is altogether ineffectual to prove that the Puráńas are modern compilations; for it is not supported by either probability or proof, or by the internal evidence of those works; and it, thus, entirely fails in demonstrating that the Puráńas were written or remodelled for the purpose of promoting the innovations introduced into the Hindu religion by Śankara Áchárya, Rámánuja, Madhwácharya, and Vallabha, and of advocating the doctrines which they taught. All the remarks, therefore, on this subject, which Professor Wilson has yet published, are completely erroneous; and it may,

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.

† *Ibid.*

in consequence, be concluded that there are no valid grounds for disputing the genuineness and antiquity of the eighteen Puráńas.

Bombay, 29*th December*, 1840.

VANS KENNEDY.

PROFESSOR WILSON'S REPLY.

SIR: Col. Vans Kennedy has lately favoured you with a series of letters upon the subject of my views of the modern date and sectarian spirit of the works termed, by the Hindus, Puráńas. I entertain great respect for the Colonel's talents and industry, but none whatever for his love of disputation, or his pertinacity of opinion, and attach little weight to deductions that are founded upon imperfect investigation, and prejudices much more inveterate than any which he accuses me of cherishing. I have, therefore, no intention of entering upon any refutation of his notions, or vindication of my own. Having put forth conclusions drawn from a deliberate and careful scrutiny of the premisses which warrant them, I am contented to leave them to their fate: if they are sound, they need not be defended; if they are erroneous, they do not deserve to be defended. I have implicit faith in the ultimate prevalence of truth; and, as I am satisfied that my conclusions are, in the present instance, true, they have nothing to apprehend from Colonel Vans Kennedy.

Neither is it necessary, now, to expend time upon any discussion as to what the Puráńas are. The con-

futation of Colonel Vans Kennedy's doctrines of their high antiquity and pure theological character is to be found in the works themselves. Translations of two of them have been published,—that of the *Vishńu Puráńa* by myself, and that of the *Srí Bhágavata* by M. Burnouf; and an appeal to these, which are now accessible to all who may be interested in the inquiry, will show how utterly untenable is Colonel Vans Kennedy's theory. If he objects to the particular examples here named, let him choose his own. He will pardon me for suggesting that he would be more usefully and creditably employed in translating and publishing some other Puráńa or Puráńas than in depreciating the better directed labours of other Sanskrit scholars. The result of such translations will, I have no doubt, confirm the conclusions which I have not found it possible to avoid, and with respect to which the opinions of M. Burnouf coincide with mine. The Puráńas, in their present form, are not of high antiquity, although they are made up, in part, of ancient materials; and, in the legends which they relate, and the practices which they enjoin, they depart as widely from what appears to be the more primitive form of Brahmanism as they do from the subjects which authorities of unquestionable weight, as well as their own texts, declare should form the essential constituents of a Puráńa.

Whilst, however, I think it a work of supererogation to refute errors which the Puráńas themselves are at hand to correct, I must beg leave to set Colonel Vans Kennedy right on a matter not of opinion, but of fact. Conscious, no doubt, that his arguments will not bear the test of comparison with the original works, he has

attempted, at the close of his last letter, to insinuate a suspicion that the translation is not to be trusted, and charges me with having misunderstood and mistranslated a passage that is of some importance as a criterion of the date of the Puráńa. He does not say that I have done so purposely, in order to fabricate a false foundation for my opinions; but the tendency of his animadversions leads to such an inference. To this inference I cannot stoop to reply; but I shall have no difficulty in showing that the charge of misapprehension applies not to me, but to Colonel Vans Kennedy.

Now, I will not venture to affirm that, in a work of some extent and, occasionally, of some difficulty, I have never mistaken my original; that I have always been sufficiently careful in expressing its purport; that I may not have, sometimes, in the course of a translation not professing to be literal,* diverged more than was prudent from the letter of my text. The latter may have been the case, in the passage in question; and Col. Vans Kennedy is literally correct in stating that the very words "Jainas and Bauddhas" are not in the Sanskrit, where they are found in the English. At the same time, had he fully comprehended the sense of the preceding passages, had he been aware that all which had gone before related to Jainas and Bauddhas, he must have admitted that their specification, which was recommended by the consideration of perspicuity, and by the construction of the English

* Whatever Professor Wilson may have meant, his words are: "In rendering the text into English, I have adhered to it as literally as was compatible with some regard to the usages of English composition." Vol. I., Preface, p. CXVI.

version, was warranted by the context, and was, therefore, unobjectionable.*

I will not think so meanly of Col. Vans Kennedy's criticism, as to suppose it possible that it would cavil at words, or that it would attach any importance to the insertion of the terms "Jainas and Bauddhas" in the place where they occur, if it could be substantiated that, in all the preceding parts of the chapter, the text has had them in contemplation. This he denies, and I maintain. We shall see which is right.

The eighteenth Chapter of the third Book of the *Vishńu Puráńa* describes, in the first part, the apostacy of certain persons from the Brahmanical faith,—from the Vedas and Smŕitis—in consequence of the doctrines of a false teacher, who is Vishńu in disguise. The heresies into which they fell were *two*. Col. Vans Kennedy's interpretation is "*one*"; and here is the source of his misapprehension. That he labours under an erroneous view of the sense of the passage, a brief examination of it will irrefutably demonstrate.

In the first place, then, speaking of those who first became followers of the false prophet, the text says, expressly: "They were called *Árhatas*, from the phrase which the deceiver made use of, in addressing them, '*arhatha*' (Ye are worthy) of this great doctrine."† So far there can be no question that the Árhatas are named, by the *Vishńu Puráńa*, as one set of schismatics.

* The words in question—Vol. III., p. 211,—are "Jaina and Bauddha"; and, since Professor Wilson tacitly professed to translate on a uniform plan, he should have included them in parentheses, just as, in the preceding paragraph, he has parenthesized the words "and became Bauddhas".

† Compare the rendering in Vol. III., p. 209.

It is very true that we have not the name of the other apostate sect enunciated; but it is indicated in a manner not to be mistaken. "Know ye," says the teacher,—*budhyaswa.** "It is known," reply the disciples,—*budhyate.*† If these inflexions of the verb *budh*, 'to know,' do not clearly intimate the followers of a faith who, from the same root, are named *Bauddhas*, I should like to know to what other class of Indian religionists it can apply.‡

It is not, however, from inferences, even thus palpable, that I am justified in limiting the designation of Bauddhas to the sect here described. Col. Vans Kennedy is told, in my Preface, that I have, invariably, consulted an able commentary on the text of the *Vishńu Puráńa*; and to this commentary he either has, or has not, referred: if he has not, he has come to his task of criticism very ill-prepared; if he has, he should, in candour, have admitted that what he is pleased to term my misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the text was shared by learned Hindus, who, most assuredly, could not be suspected of any disposition to derogate from the sanctity and antiquity of such sacred books as the Puráńas. If the word *Bauddha* is inaccurately specified, the error is as much the commentator's as mine. Col. Vans Kennedy may, possibly, set a higher value upon his own erudition than that of any native Pandit: he must not expect others to agree with him in an estimate; and, at any rate, he is bound, in fairness, to admit the existence of such an authority, supposing him to be aware of it,

* Correct to *budhyadhwam.* Moreover, *budhyaswa* means "know thou".

† See note † in the next page.

‡ *Vide infra*, p. 368, note †.

when he condemns an interpretation which it fully justifies. Ratnagarbha, the commentator on the *Vishńu Puráńa*, explicitly states that, "in the repeated use of the words *budhyaswa** and *budhyate*,† it is the intention of the text to explain the meaning of the denomination *Bauddha* (*Evaḿ budhyatety-atra punaruktir Bauddha-pada-niruktyarthá*.)" I have been fully authorized, therefore, in inserting the term *Bauddhas*.

Having, thus, vindicated, unanswerably, the propriety of employing the word *Bauddha*, we come to that of *Jaina*. It has been shown that the Árhatas are named; and by these, I affirm, Jainas are intended. Col. Vans Kennedy asserts that the term is applied, in this very place, to Bauddhas, and adds: "It is singular . . that Professor Wilson should assume, in direct opposition to the authority of the Puráńa which he has, himself, translated, that the term *Árhata*, when it occurs . . . . in the Puráńas, should be considered to apply to Jina, and not to Buddha."‡ I am not aware that I have said any such thing:§ but that is of no matter. In the passage in dispute, I do understand *Árhatas* to mean *Jainas*; and I am not so singular, in this understanding, as Col. Vans Kennedy fancies. I again appeal to

* See note * in the preceding page.

† The commentator, having to do with a verb, would not have used the term *punarukti*, 'iteration', unless he had been referring to a repetition of the same mood. The text — see Vol. III., p. 211, note §, — exhibits *budhyata*, *budhyadhwam*, and *budhyata* again. Professor Wilson omitted to translate the first, hastily misrepresented the second, and mistook the third. If *evam* in the text, and *iti* in the commentary, had been preceded by *budhyate*, the result would have been *budhyata evam* and *budhyata iti*.

‡ *Vide supra*, p. 323.

§ As much may, however, fairly be taken as implied in Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXXIX., LXXX.

the commentator, in support of my translation. The Colonel, not perceiving that two different sects are described, asserts, as just seen, that *Árhatas*, in this place, means *Buddhists*. Had he taken pains to be better informed, he would have found that there was sufficient authority for distinguishing them in this passage, and he would not have made an assertion so utterly at variance with the general purport of the whole of the description. *Árhata* does not mean *Buddhist*; for the commentator expressly observes, of the object of the text, when describing the operations of the false teacher: "Having expounded the doctrine of the Árhatas, he proceeded to explain the doctrine of the Bauddhas (*Árhata-matam uktwá Bauddha-matam áha.*)" Ratnagarbha, therefore, unequivocally asserts that *two* sects (not *one*) are here described, and that Árhatas are a different class of sectarians from Buddhists or Bauddhas. Col. Vans Kennedy is, therefore, wholly mistaken in understanding the passage to relate to *one* sect of schismatics only, and is wholly wrong in confounding Árhatas and Buddhists.

That Árhatas are not, in this place, Buddhists, is undeniable, upon authority which few will fail to prefer to Colonel Vans Kennedy's; and it only remains to determine what they are. To any one at all acquainted with the practices and tenets of the Jainas, as they have been explained by Mr. Colebrooke, they are sufficiently well indicated by allusions in the text of the *Vishńu Purána*, in the passage in question, to leave no doubt that they are intended. If Jainas are not meant, what are the schismatics here described by their doctrines, and designated by the term *Árhatas?*

They are not Bauddhas; that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Árhatas with Bauddhas, there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas. That the term does, very commonly, denote Jainas, is familiar to all who ever heard of either. Perhaps Colonel Vans Kennedy will admit this; perhaps he will, also, admit that the celebrated Jaina teacher and lexicographer Hemachandra is some authority for the accurate designation of the sect of which he was so distinguished an ornament, and that he gives the word *Arhat* as a synonym of *Jina*, *Tírthankara*, and the like.* This is a mere waste of words. When *Árhata* does not mean a *Bauddha*, it means a *Jaina*. It cannot mean a Bauddha, in the passages of the *Vishńu Puráńa* which are now under discussion; because the Bauddhas are also specified and distinguished by both text and commentary: it, therefore, does mean Jaina; and, consequently, I am fully authorized in inserting the words *Jainas* and *Bauddhas* in the Translation.† The misapprehension is not mine; it is my critic's: with which restitution of what appertains to him, and not to me, I take my leave of him, and of all further controversy with him.

H. H. Wilson.

COLONEL KENNEDY'S REJOINDER.

Sir: The letter of Professor Wilson, inserted in the number of your Journal for May last (received here

* *Haima-kośa*, I., 24.

† This conclusion is not easy to accept. *Vide supra*, p. 360, note *.

on the 7th instant), has much surprised me; as I do not understand why he accuses me of "love of disputation" and "pertinacity of opinion": for the opinions expressed in the letters which I, some time ago, transmitted to you are contained in my work on Ancient and Hindu Mythology, published in 1831; and, to prepare materials for that work, I actually read, and carefully examined, all the eighteen Puráńas, except the *Bhavishya*. When, therefore, Professor Wilson, in the Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, took so very different a view of the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráńas, as now extant, nothing could be more unobjectionable than my examining critically the remarks contained in that Preface, and making public the result of that examination. Nor could it be reasonably expected that I should admit the correctness of that view, when it appeared to me to have been formed on insufficient and erroneous grounds.

In his letter, Professor Wilson very politely observes: "Conscious, no doubt, that his arguments will not bear the test of comparison with the original works,[1] he has attempted, at the close of his last letter, to insinuate a suspicion that the translation is not to be trusted." I have, however, neither insinuated nor stated any objections to the accuracy of that Translation, except in one instance, in p. 340,* in which Professor Wilson has thus translated a passage of the *Vishńu Puráńa*: "The delusions of the false teacher paused

[1] On the contrary, I have, in my former letters, transcribed the original Sanskrit, in the few instances in which I have specifically contradicted the statements of Professor Wilson.

* Vol. III., p. 211, in the present edition.

not with the conversion of the Daityas to the Jaina and Bauddha heresies." Of this passage I transcribed the original Sanskrit, in my last letter, in order to show that the terms *Jaina* and *Bauddha* were not contained in it. But I further observed: "Professor Wilson may have supposed that the term *Árhata* denoted the Jainas, and may have understood, from the words *budhyadhwam* and *budhyate*, that they applied to the Buddhists; and to this there could be no objection, had he expressed his opinion in a note, and not introduced into the text, the title of the chapter, and the index, the terms *Jainas* and *Bauddhas*." I, thus, anticipated all that Professor Wilson has said on this point, in his letter; and, as he admits, in it, that these terms are not to be found in the original, the question is, simply: Is a translator at liberty to insert, in the original text of the work which he translates, a name which is not contained in it, and then to argue that the work must be of modern date, because that particular name occurs in it? Such is the case, in the present instance; for Professor Wilson affirms that the Jainas are mentioned in the *Vishńu Puráńa*, and adopts this circumstance as a criterion for fixing the dates when the Puráńas were composed: but this name is not to be found in that Puráńa; and I, therefore, justly objected to its being introduced into the Translation.

Professor Wilson, however, in his letter, remarks: "I will not think so meanly of Colonel Vans Kennedy's criticism, as to suppose it possible that it would cavil at words, or that it would attach any importance to the insertion of the terms 'Jainas and Bauddhas' in

the place where they occur, if it could be substantiated that, in all the preceding parts of the chapter, the text has had them in contemplation." But it is precisely to this that I object; for I contend that, in judging of the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráńas, their text should be allowed to speak for itself, and not as it may be interpreted by translators and commentators. For, with respect to the passage in dispute, I observed, in my last letter: "Professor Wilson, therefore, has given to this chapter an interpretation not authorized by the original, in which nothing occurs which indicates that the composer of this Puráńa intended to describe either Buddha or Jina, under this illusory form, or to adopt, or allude to, their doctrines, in the words spoken by it." To this he replies, in his letter: "In the first place, then, speaking of those who first became followers of the false prophet, the text says, expressly: 'They were called *Árhatas*, from the phrase which the deceiver made use of, in addressing them, '*arhatha*' (Ye are worthy) of this great doctrine.' So far there can be no question that the Árhatas are named, by the *Vishńu Puráńa*, as one sect of schismatics." Admitted. He proceeds: "It is very true that *we have not the name* of the other apostate sect enunciated; but *it is indicated*[1] in a manner not to be mistaken. 'Know ye,' says the teacher,—*budhyadhwam*.* 'It is known,' reply the disciples,—*budhyate*. If these inflexions of the verb *budh*, 'to know', do not clearly

[1] The italics, in these two instances, are mine.

* Here Colonel Kennedy silently corrects an inadvertence of Professor Wilson. *Vide supra*, p. 361, note *.

intimate the followers of a faith who, from the same root, are named *Bauddhas*, I should like to know to what other class of Indian religionists it can apply." But there is nothing whatever, in the original, which shows that the second address of this false teacher was intended to inculcate doctrines different from those taught in his first address.* On the contrary, the former appears to be, clearly, a continuation of the latter; and, as it is not said, in the original, that a sect was denominated from the word *budhyadhwam*,† in the same manner that it is said that a sect was denominated from the word *arhatha*, it is most probable that, in this passage, the *Árhata* sect is, alone, intended. But Professor Wilson observes: "If Jainas are not meant, what are the schismatics here described by their doctrines, and designated by the term *Árhatas?* They are not Bauddhas; that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Árhatas with Bauddhas,[1] there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas."

---

[1] Professor Wilson seems to forget, here, his note in p. 339‡

---

* The Sanskrit text distinctly enough points to two forms of heterodoxy. The first is intimated as the Jaina, by mention not only of one of the names of its professors, but, also, of one of the differentiae of their doctrines; and the stanza to which reference is made, just above, intends, undeniably, the Bauddha. The writer of the *Vishńu-puráńa* seems to regard the Jainas and the Bauddhas as, in some sort, cognate. That he represents the Jainas as preceding the Bauddhas manifests that his information as to the history of these two classes of religionists was far from exact,—a striking argument of his modernity.

† If Colonel Vans Kennedy had recognized that the original has *budhyata, budhyadhwam*, and *budhyata*,—and all in one line,—could he have resisted the conclusion that these words indicate Buddha? See, further, note ‡ in p. 377, *infra*.

‡ Vol. III., p. 209, note 2, in the present edition.

It is in this singular manner that Professor Wilson attempts to prove that the Puráńas, as now extant, are modern compilations; for he entirely disregards the original text, and substitutes, for it, his own inferences and assumptions. In this instance, he admits, in his letter, that it is the term *Árhata*, and not *Jaina*, that is contained in the original; and he, further, admits that, in it, the name *Bauddha* is not enunciated, but merely indicated; and yet he maintains that he was "fully authorized in inserting the words *Jainas* and *Bauddhas* in the Translation." He remarks, also, that, though "Colonel Vans Kennedy may, possibly, set a higher value upon his own erudition than that of any native Pandit, he must not expect others to agree with him in an estimate." But I may be permitted to observe that long experience has convinced me that, although commentaries on Sanskrit works are, no doubt, of much use, yet they are by no means safe guides for ascertaining the plain and unsophisticated meaning of the text. In objecting, therefore, to the translation of the passage in dispute, I did not think it necessary to notice whether or not it agreed with the commentary; and Professor Wilson has, now, most unfortunately for his argument, referred to it: for the commentator never uses the word *Jaina*, but always *Árhata*;* as in the passage quoted from the commentary in p. 43 of the *Asiatic Journal* for May last.† Conse-

of the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*: "Here is further confirmation of the Jainas being intended by our text; as the term Árhata is, more particularly, applied to them, although it is also used by the Buddhists."

* *Vide infra*, p. 376, note †. † *Vide supra*, p. 363.

quently, Professor Wilson has no right to quote the commentary of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, as an authority in support of his assumption, that the *Árhata* of the Puráńas means the Jaina sect.* It is, however, on this assumption that Professor Wilson, when speaking of the date of that Puráńa, hesitates not to state: "Both Bauddhas and Jainas are adverted to [in it]. It was, therefore, written before the former had disappeared.† But they existed, in some parts of India, as late as the twelfth century, at least; and it is probable that the Puráńa was compiled before that period."[1] Thus, from a few verses of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, in which no sect is mentioned except the *Árhata*, Professor Wilson assumes that the *Bauddhas* and *Jainas* are adverted to, in it, and, hence, fixes the compilation of the *Vishńu Puráńa* at some time before the twelfth century. On the total invalidity of such a mode of reasoning I need not remark; but it seems extraordinary that he should have called attention to it by his ill-judged letter; as he has, by the arguments contained in it, fully confirmed all that I have said relative to his assertions and statements being at complete variance with what is actually contained in the Puráńas, and to his being,

[1] Preface to the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*, p. LXXII.‡

* This is mere paltering. Árhata, when it does not mean Bauddha, means Jaina; and Professor Wilson, in p. 363, *supra*, quotes the commentator Ratnagarbha as saying: "Having expounded the doctrine of the Árhatas, he proceeded to explain the doctrine of the Bauddhas."

† Is this logic conclusive? Save in a spirit of prophecy, the Bauddhas could not be spoken of before they appeared. But why might not a Hindu writer make mention of them after their disappearance, just as well as during their presence?

‡ See Vol. I.; Preface, p. CXI.

in consequence, unqualified to express a correct opinion respecting their age, and their scope and tendency.

I do not, therefore, understand what Professor Wilson means by observing, in his letter, that he has "implicit faith in the ultimate prevalence of truth." I objected to his introducing into his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa* the names of two sects which are not contained in the original, and to his adopting these names as a criterion for fixing the dates of the Puráńas; and he admits these facts. The truth, consequently, in this instance, belongs to my objections. Although, also, he considers it quite superfluous to enter into any controversy with me, yet it has been hitherto supposed that discussion was the best means of ascertaining the truth: and it is, surely, not sufficient that the Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford should be satisfied that his conclusions are true; for it might be expected that he would be prepared to support those conclusions, whenever controverted, by argument and authority. Professor Wilson may think that my deductions are founded on imperfect investigation and inveterate prejudice, and that the refutation of my doctrines of the high antiquity and pure theological[1] character of the Puráńas is to be found in the works themselves.* But this is not enough; for, if my theory on these points is utterly untenable, it

[1] I have never described the Puráńas as being *purely theological*; as I have merely stated that their principal object is moral and religious instruction; and I have, invariably, used the words "mythology" and "theology" in order to show that these subjects are of a distinct nature, although both are treated of in the Puráńas.

* *Vide supra*, pp. 357, 358.

would, most assuredly, be much more conducive to the prevalence of truth to expose its erroneousness than to refer, for its refutation, to such voluminous works as the Puráńas, which scarcely any person will take the trouble to examine. The weight, however, which should be attached to my opinions respecting the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráńas, as now extant, is not the point in question; for I observed, in my last letter, that Professor Wilson had taken a most erroneous view of the remote and actual state of the Hindu religion, which had, alone, led him to ascribe a modern origin to the Puráńas; but, that, "as he has not quoted any passages from the Puráńas, in which sectarial fervour and exclusiveness are exhibited, and in which circumstances of comparatively recent date are mentioned, it may be concluded that he knew of no such passages; as their production would, at once, have proved the point which he wished to establish.* This negative argument acquires the greater force from Professor Wilson having stated that he has collected a voluminous series of indices, abstracts, and translations of particular parts of all the Puráńas; and, consequently, if any passages occur, in them, which inculcate the *exclusive* worship of Vishńu or Śiva, or the worship of Ráma, Kŕishńa, or Śakti, or which mention the Jainas, or any modern sect, or any comparatively recent event,† he could have had no difficulty in producing such passages, in support of his statements; and their non-production, therefore, must be considered

* *Vide supra*, p. 340, notes 1 and *; also, p. 353, note †.

† For Pauráńik mention of the introduction of the Parsees into India, *vide infra*, pp. 381—385.

as strong proof of their non-existence." It is not, consequently, the opinions which Professor Wilson or myself entertains on this subject that should be considered, but that which is actually contained in the Puráńas. I affirm that the Puráńas do not contain what Professor Wilson has stated is contained in them; and, as I cannot be required to prove a negative, it remains with him to produce such passages, from those works, as will demonstrate that my affirmation is unfounded. Until, however, such passages are produced, I may be allowed to repeat my former conclusions, that Professor Wilson's opinion, that the Puráńas, as now extant, are compilations made between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, rests solely on gratuitous assumptions and unfounded assertions, and that his reasoning, in support of it, is either futile, fallacious, contradictory, or improbable.

It is not, I may trust, necessary that I should disclaim all intention of depreciating, by what I have written at any time, the labours of any Sanskrit scholar. In the present instance, in particular, as I had given some time and some attention to the examination of the Puráńas, and to acquiring information concerning the remote and actual state of the Hindu religion, I saw no reason for refraining from making public my objections to the view which Professor Wilson had taken of the age, the scope, and the tendency of the Puráńas, in the Preface to his Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*. It must, also, be evident that, if the opinions expressed respecting any part of Sanskrit literature were not controverted, when erroneous, it would be impossible that the real nature of that literature could

ever be ascertained. Had, therefore, Professor Wilson been solicitous for the prevalence of truth, he should not have been indignant at the remarks on his theory, which you obliged me by publishing in the *Asiatic Journal*; but, on the contrary, he should have taken the trouble of examining my objections, and of exposing their erroneousness, if unfounded; but, if founded, candour and the love of truth should have induced him to acknowledge that he had called in question, on insufficient grounds, the genuineness and antiquity of the eighteen Puráńas.[1]

Bombay, 17*th July*, 1841.

VANS KENNEDY.

NOTE.

Professor Wilson seems to have misunderstood the reason which led me to point out, in my last letter, that he had misunderstood and misinterpreted a passage in a Puráńa which he had, himself, translated: for, in his reply, he merely defends the introduction, into the translation, of the words "Jainas" and "Bauddhas";

---

[1] It is singular that Professor Wilson has, in one part of his letter, adopted my view of the subject; as he actually speaks, in it,* of "learned Hindus, who, most assuredly, could not be suspected of any disposition to derogate from the sanctity and antiquity of such sacred books as the Puráńas." It would seem, therefore, that, however satisfied Professor Wilson may be with the truth of the conclusions which he has published, he, nevertheless, fluctuates in his opinion respecting the sanctity and antiquity of the Puráńas, as now extant, or their being modern compilations, made for the purpose of sectarial imposture.

---

* *Vide supra*, p. 361.

but he says nothing with respect to his having adopted the names of these sects as a criterion for fixing the modern dates at which he thinks the Puráńas were written. It was, however, to this that I particularly objected, in my former letters; for, in p. L. of the Preface to the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráńa*,* Professor Wilson states that "the date of the Kúrma Puráńa is, avowedly, posterior to the establishment of the Jaina sect: and that there is no reason to believe that the doctrines of Arhat or Jina were known in the early centuries of our era."† And, in his notes to the Translation, pp. 339, 340, 341,‡ he remarks: "Here is further confirmation of the Jainas being intended by our text."—"We, have, therefore, the Bauddhas noticed as a distinct sect. If the author wrote from a personal knowledge of Buddhists in India, he could not have written much later than the tenth or eleventh century."[1]—"We may have, in this

[1] But why not much earlier? As it is sufficiently proved that Buddha flourished in the sixth century *before* our era.

* See Vol. I, Preface, p. LXXIX. If Colonel Vans Kennedy had quoted more ingenuously, the reader would have seen that, in the passage which Professor Wilson translates from the *Kúrma-puráńa*, the Bhairava, Váma, and Yámala scriptures are named with the Árhata; and, the former being modern, there is a strong presumption that the term Árhata is meant to denote a faith more recent than the Bauddha,—namely, the Jaina. Still more cogent, as against the Colonel, is his own fuller rendering—in pp. 286, 287, *supra*,—of the passage in question. For, there, besides the scriptures just enumerated, those of the Kapálas are specified; and the Kapálas are not known as a sect of much antiquity.

† Suspicion of mistake or forgery not being entertained, already in the fifth century of our era the Jainas must have been a sect of some considerable age. For a Jaina inscription, said to be dated in the Śaka year 411, corresponding to A. D. 489, see the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. V., pp. 343, 344.

‡ See Vol. III., pp. 209, 211, 214.

conflict of the orthodox divinities and heretical Daityas, some covert allusion to political troubles, growing out of religious differences, and the final predominance of Brahmanism. Such occurrences seem to have preceded the invasion of India by the Mohammedans, and prepared the way for their victories."

But, after thus making use of the names "Jainas" and "Bauddhas", to prove the modern compilation of the Puráńas, Professor Wilson now admits that these names are not to be found in the original; but he maintains that he was fully authorized in inserting them in it, by the context and commentary. Yet, in his letter, he quotes no part of the context,* in order to evince that it relates to the Jainas and Buddhists, and rests his argument, in support of its being these sects that are intended in the passage in dispute, solely on the words *Árhata*, and *budhyadhwam*, and *budhyate*. But the commentator does not say that *Árhata* means *Jaina*;† and Professor Wilson assigns no other reason

---

* The English translation, even apart from Professor Wilson's supplementations, is quite sufficient to show that the Jainas and Bauddhas are meant to be described.

† I think I am not wrong in saying that Hindu writers, as a rule,— so far as I have examined them,—affect the terms Arhat and Árhata, rather than Jina and Jaina. Possibly the former may have become, comparatively, more dyslogistic, as they easily might, by suggestion; for, though Jina was the name of a Buddha,—but one not much heard of, apparently, in later times,—Arhat denoted another Buddha, whose name was of more frequent mention, perhaps from its adoption by the Jainas. These religionists, while professing no reverence for Buddha, did profess reverence for Arhat, an equivocal designation, and which reminded of the Bauddhas; and this fact, it may be, influenced the Hindus, with their hatred of Buddhism and everything therewith cognate, to call the Jainas, by preference, Árhatas. It should seem that the Jainas, among themselves, were more generally denominated Jainas.

for supposing that these two sects are one and the same than that, as the *Árhatas* cannot be Bauddhas, they must be Jainas. I am, however, obliged to observe that the original does not in any manner admit of this translation in p. 339:* "In this manner, exclaiming to them, 'Know' (*budhyadhwam*), and they replying, 'It is known' (*budhyate*), these Daityas were induced, by the arch-deceiver, to deviate from their religious duties (and become Bauddhas)." For, in the original,—at least, according to my copy of it,—it is not said that the words *budhyadhwam* and *budhyate* were spoken by this emanation of Vishńu and the Daityas; but they are distinctly ascribed to Paráśara, the narrator of the Puráńa, who, after relating what was said by this false teacher, proceeds to narrate that it was thus by saying "know ye", and, they replying "it is known", that Máyámoha caused the Daityas to forsake their religion.[1]† The word *budhyadhwam*, how-

---

[1] पराशर उवाच ।
एवं बुध्यध्वं बुध्यतैवमितीरयन् ।
मायामोहः स दैतेयान्धर्ममत्याजयन्निजम् ॥ ‡
Vishńu Puráńa, Part III., Chap. XVIII.

On the waning of the Bauddhas, while religious rivalry was still active, and controversial debate still ran high, no doubt the Hindus transferred to the Jainas a liberal share of the animosity of which their heretical congeners had been the object.

See, further, *infra*, p. 379, note †.

* See Vol. III., p. 210.

† See my translation of the passage, in Vol. III., p. 210, note §. Professor Wilson, in his rendering of the passage, omits, as he frequently omits, the introductory words "Paráśara said". But the omission, in this instance, is of no help to Colonel Vans Kennedy's argumentation,—if such it may be called.

‡ For the correct reading of the first verse, see Vol. III., p. 210,

ever, is used in this address of the false teacher, but evidently in its usual sense; for Professor Wilson thus translates the sentence in which it occurs: "Understand my words; for they have been uttered by the wise."* There are, consequently, no grounds whatever for supposing that the words *budhyadhwam* and *budhyate* were, in this passage, intended to indicate the "Bauddhas"; and, as this emanation of Vishńu was not Buddha,† it must be evident that the doctrines which he is here represented as teaching could not be the same as those which were first taught by Buddha. The original, therefore, did not justify this gloss of Professor Wilson, "and become Bauddhas": for it is not said, in it, that, after the false teacher had addressed

---

note §. Provided there is not a typographical oversight, was it because he could make nothing of the word बुध्यत which he leaves out, that the Colonel abridged the text?

In thinking, like Professor Wilson, that the word coalescing with एवं is बुध्यते, he evinced forgetfulness of a most elementary rule of Sanskrit grammar.

Though Professor Wilson misapprehended the sense of the stanza in question, his very confident critic did not take a single step towards setting him right.

* See Vol. III., p. 210. The original is:

बुध्यध्वं मे वचः सम्यग्बुधैरेवमुदीरितम् ।

† According to the *Padma-puráńa*, the god Śiva declares:

दैत्यानां नाशनार्थाय विष्णुना बुद्धरूपिणा ।
बौद्धशास्त्रमसत्प्रोक्तं नग्ननीलपटादिकम् ॥

"In order to the destruction of the Daityas, the false Bauddha system—with *its* naked *images*, blue vestments, and the rest,—*was* enunciated by Vishńu in the form of Buddha."

Here there is a distinct reference, in direct contradiction of Colonel Kennedy's positive assertion.

I have no copy of the *Padma-puráńa* at hand, by which to verify this extract. It will be found quoted in p. 6 of my edition of the *Sáńkhya-pravachana-bháshya*, in the *Bibliotheca Indica*.

the Daityas* a second time, a second sect was originated; and it appears evident that, throughout this passage, the text relates to no other sect than the *Árhata*, which is, alone, mentioned in it.

It is, hence, undeniable that Professor Wilson has not "vindicated, unanswerably, the propriety of employing the word *Bauddha*"; and, consequently, the singular futility of his argument, with respect to the Jainas, becomes the more conspicuous. The Árhatas "are not Bauddhas (he says); that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Árhatas with Bauddhas, there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas." But, as Professor Wilson has not produced, and I am certain that he cannot produce, any Sanskrit authority which proves that the *Árhata* of the Puráńas is the same as the Jaina sect,† and, as

---

* But not those who had already been proselytized. *Vide supra*, p. 351, note *.

† There is no question that the Puráńas were written after the rise of the Jainas, and that the authors of the Puráńas, equally with their successors, designated them, preferably, as Árhatas. *Vide supra*, p. 376, note †.

I do not mean, however, that the Jainas were called Árhatas only. *Vide supra*, p. 351, note †.

In Nágeśa Bhaťťa's gloss on Govardhana's *Saptaśati*, entitled *Guru-vyákhyá*, the subjoined verses, which follow a denunciation of Śáńdilya as heretical, are quoted from the *Linga-puráńa*:

पाञ्चरात्रं भागवतं बौद्धं दैगम्बरं तथा ।
लोकायतं च कापालं सौमं पाशुपतं तथा ॥
लाकुलं(?) भैरवं वामं शाक्तं शाम्भवयामले ।
एवंविधानि शास्त्राणि विरुद्धानि महामुने ॥
स्वतः प्रमाणभूतेन वेदेन मुनिसत्तम ।
वैदिकस्तानि शास्त्राणि मनसापि न संस्मरेत् ॥

Doctrines here specified, and stigmatized as repugnant to the Veda, are the Páncharátra, the Bhágavata, the Bauddha, the Daigambara, the

he here admits that it is not the same as the Buddhist sect, it must, consequently, follow that the "Jainas" and "Bauddhas" are neither mentioned nor indicated* in the passage in dispute; and that he, therefore, attempts in vain to show that he was fully authorized in inserting the names of these sects in his translation.

V. K.

Lokáyata, the Kápála, the Sauma, the Páśupata, the Lákula(?), the Bhairava, the Váma, the Śákta, the Śámbhava, and the Yámala.

It would be very riskful to deny that the term Daigambara here points to one of the two grand divisions of the Jainas.

The preceding passage I have been obliged, from want of access to manuscripts, to take on trust.

* As to palpable indication of the Bauddhas there, *vide supra*, p. 368, note †.

CORRIGENDA, &c.

VOL. I.

PREFACE.

P. VII., note †. That Colonel Wilford was acquainted with the *Jyotirvidábharańa* appears from the *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. IX., pp. 82, 131.

P. XLV., note *. *Read* editor's note in p. LV. *infra*.

P. LVI., l. 11. The Translator had, erroneously, "Kroshťuki," where I have put Kraushťuki.

P. LXII., ll. 10—14. The work there described is properly entitled *Vahni-puráńa*, and differs from the *Agni-puráńa*.

P. LXIV., l. 15. The following observations touching the Magas were communicated by Professor Wilson to Père Reinaud, and will be found in his *Mémoire Géographique, Historique et Scientifique sur l'Inde, etc.*, pp. 391—397:

"In the brief notice of the Bhavishya Puráńa which I have given in the Preface of the Vishńu Puráńa, it is stated that the greatest part of the work relates to the worship of the Sun, and that, in the last chapters, there is some curious matter relating to the Magas, worshippers of the Sun; as if the compiler had adopted the Persian term Mugh, and connected the fire-worshippers of Iran with those of India. But the subject, it is added, requires further investigation.

"The last twelve or fourteen chapters of the Bhavishya Puráńa are, in fact, dedicated to the tradition, of which a summary and not altogether accurate account has been given by Colonel Wilford, in the Eleventh Volume of the Asiatic Researches, and which records the introduction of the worship of the Sun into the north-west of Hindusthán, by Sámba, the son of Kŕishńa. This prince, having become a leper, through the imprecation of the irascible sage Durvásas, whom he had offended, and despairing of a cure from human skill, resolved to retire into the forest, and apply himself to the adoration of Súrya, of whose graciousness and power he had learned many marvellous instances from the sage Nárada. Having obtained the assent of Kŕishńa, Sámba departed from Dwáraká; and, proceeding from the northern bank of the Sindhu (Indus), he crossed the great river the Chandrabhágá (the Chinab), to the celebrated grove of Mitra (Mitravana), where, by fasting, penance, and prayer, he acquired the favour of Súrya, and was cleansed of his leprosy. By Súrya's injunctions, and as a mark of his gratitude, Sámba engaged to construct a temple of the Sun, and to found, in connexion with it, a city on the banks of the Chandrabhágá. As he was in some uncertainty what form of the Sun he should set up, a miraculous image of great splendour appeared to him, when bathing, which floated on the current, and, being wafted to the shore, was accepted by Sámba, as sent to him by the original, and was, accordingly, placed, with due honour, in the temple dedicated to the Sun.

"After narrating these events, several chapters of the Puráńa are occupied with the instructions communicated to Sámba by Nárada, regarding the ceremonies to be observed in the construction of the

temple and the daily worship of the image. Sámba is desirous of retaining learned and pious Brahmans for the purpose of performing the appointed rites, and receiving the donations he may make to the Sun; but Nárada, in the spirit of the prohibition found in Manu, against the performance of idol-worship, as a source of emolument, by Brahmans, apprises Sámba that no Brahman can undertake the office of ministering priest without incurring degradation in this life, and punishment in the next. He, therefore, refers Sámba to Gauramukha (White-face), the Purohita (or family-priest) of Ugrasena, king of Mathurá, as the only person who could tell him whom he might most suitably employ as the officiating priests of the Sun; and Gauramukha directs him, in consequence, to invite the Magas to discharge the duty, as they are, in an especial degree, the worshippers of Súrya.

"The Magas, according to the legend narrated, not very distinctly, by the compiler of the Puráńa, were at once the progeny of Agni and Áditya (Fire and the Sun,) by Nishkumbhá, the daughter of a holy sage named Ŕiju or Ŕijwáhwa (*ŕiju*, upright, and *áhwá*, appellation), of the race named Mihira. She was dedicated to Agni by her father; but the Sun, fascinated by her beauty, assumed the form of Agni, and begot a son, named Jalagambu, from whom sprang the Magas. Ŕiju, displeased with his daughter, condemned her offspring to degradation; but the Sun, at Nishkumbhá's entreaty, although he could not raise the Magas to a level with the Brahmans, conferred upon them the almost equal distinction of being his chosen ministers.

"Although Gauramukha could inform Sámba what priests the prince ought to employ, he is represented as ignorant of the place where they dwelt, and, referring Sámba again to the Sun, Súrya desires him to repair to Śáka-dwípa, beyond the sea of salt water, in which region the Magas corresponded with the caste of Brahmans in Jambu-dwípa or India; the other three castes being the Magasas, Mánasas, and Mandagas, equivalent to Kshattriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śúdras: there were no mixed castes in Śáka-dwípa. It may be here observed that a similar enumeration of the tribes of Śáka-dwípa occurs in other Puráńas, as in the Vishńu Puráńa, where, instead of Magas, the Translation has Mŕigas: but this may be only a various and, perhaps, an inaccurate reading of the original manuscript.

"In obedience to the commands of Súrya, and with the help of Kŕishńa, who lent him the use of Garuda for the journey, Sámba went to Śáka-dwípa, and induced eighteen families of Magas to return with him to India, to fulfil the function of ministering priests in the temple of the Sun, which he now completed, building, at the same time, around the temple, a spacious city, which was called, after him, Sámbapura. The legend also relates that the Yádava prince prevailed upon his kinsmen, the Bhojas of Dwáraká, a branch of the race of Yadu, to give their daughters, in marriage, to his Magas; and their descendants were, thence, called Bhojakas. But, in a subsequent passage, with an inconsistency not unfrequent in some of the Puráńas, it is said that ten only of the eighteen families received damsels of the tribe of Bhoja, whilst the other eight, who were of the rank only of Śúdras, although equally worshippers of the Sun, were married to Śáka maidens: their descendants were named Mandagas.

So far there is little, in the legend, beyond the name Maga, and the worship of the Sun, to suggest any connexion between it and the history of the fire-worshippers of Persia. But there are other particulars mentioned, which are of a more explicit tenour. They cannot, however, always be satisfactorily made out, in consequence of the obvious inaccuracy of the texts, arising, in a great measure, from the usual carelessness of the copyists, but partly from the occurrence of terms, probably ill understood and imperfectly represented by the original writer. There are three copies of the Bhavishya Puráńa in the Library of the East India House, and two in the Bodleian. One of each collection omits the legend: of the remaining copies, the Oxford manuscript is the most correct; but it abounds in mistakes. Dr. Maximilian Müller has kindly furnished me with a transcript of the passages I required, and has enabled me to collate them with the East India House copies, from which, although some particulars remain doubtful, yet enough may be extracted to establish the identity of the Magas of the Puráńas with the followers of Zoroaster.

"In answer to various questions relating to the practices of the Magas, put by Sámba, the Sage Vyása professes to give him some account of them, beginning with the explanation of their name, which is not very intelligible. Apparently, it may be rendered: 'The Magas are so called because they do not proceed by a contrary Veda' (*viparyastena vedena Magá náyantyato magáh́*; as if from *má*, 'not', and *gá*, 'who goes'); the writer considering the precepts of the Zend authorities as not opposed to those of the Vedas. The Sun, Vyása continues, in the form of fire, bears or wears (*dhárayate*) what he calls a *kúrcha*; and, therefore, the Magas are wearers of it (*kúrcha-dhárińah́*): the word ordinarily implies a bunch of peacock-feathers; but it may have, in this place, some other sense. The Magas eat in silence, whence they are called *Mauninah́* (silentiaries). They are also termed *Vacharcha*, from *Vacha*, said to be a name of the Sun, and *archá*, 'worship'. They have four Vedas, termed *Vada*, *Viśwa-vada*, *Vidut*(?), and *Angirasa*(?). Gepa or Gesha (perhaps for Śesha), the great serpent, having cast off his skin in the Sun's car, it became the origin of what is here called the *Amáhaka*, which is given by the Magas, on solemn occasions, and with appropriate *mantras* or prayers. This is somewhat differently told a few lines afterwards. All creatures, it is there said,—Gods, Ŕishis, Rákshasas, Nágas,—assemble, at stated periods, in the chariot of the Sun; and, on one of these occasions, Vásuki, the king of the serpents, dropped his old skin: it was picked up by Aruńa, and given, by him, to the Sun, who put it on round his waist, in honour of Vásuki, as if unseparated from the body of the Nága, whence it was called *Avyanga* (from *a*, 'not,' *vi* 'apart from,' and *anga*, 'the body'). From its being thus worn by the Sun, it became sacred, in the estimation of his worshippers; and they, therefore, constantly wear it. Whoever goes without it is impious and impure, and falls into hell Like the *Munja* of the Brahmans, it is said, it should be put on in the eighth year from conception. It is to be made of cotton, or wool, of one colour: the best kind is 132 inches (or fingers) long; the next, 120; and it should never be less than 108 inches in length. Other names appear to be applied to it, as *Amáhaka*, *Śára-pradhána*, *Bháva-sára*, and *Śára-mara*; but this is uncertain, as the passage is corrupt, and some other article may be intended, invested with which, and the *Avyanga*, the worshipper is said to be *Pa-*

ṫhitánga. Again, in place of the *Darbha*, or sacred grass of the Brahmans, the *Pavitra*, or purificatory instrument of sacrifice of the Magas, is said, by Vyása, to be called *Varsma*, or (in another place,) *Varsama*.

"A variety of other particulars are briefly mentioned, some of which are intelligible, others uncertain. A Maga must not touch a dead body, nor a woman at certain seasons; he should (not?) cast a dead dog on the earth, and should not die without worshipping the Sun. He should let his beard grow, travel on foot, cover his face in worshipping, and hold what is called the *Púrńaka* in the right hand, and the *Śankha* (conch-shell?) in the left; and he should worship the Sun at the three Sandhyás, and at the five festivals. Other details are too questionably particularized to be specified; but more than enough has been cited to establish the fact that the Bhavishya Puráńa intends, by Magas, the Mughs of the Persians, the Magi of the Greeks, and the Parsees of India. Thus, the rule of eating in silence, the covering of the mouth at worship, the prohibition of touching a corpse, or, at least, the impurity thereby contracted, are characteristic of the Parsee faith. A still more decisive indication is furnished by what is related of the *Avyanga*, which is, clearly, the sacred girdle of the Parsees, called, most commonly, *Kusti* or *Kosti*, but also *Aiwyonghám*, according to Anquetil du Perron, as quoted by Dr. John Wilson, in his notices of the Parsee religion. The latter also observes, almost in the words attributed to Vyása: 'The *Kusti* bears some analogy to the *Munja* of the Brahmans.' According to him, the *Kusti* should be put on when the child has attained the age of seven years, seven months, and ten days, (which agrees well enough with our text); and the wickedness of not wearing it, and the consequences of such impiety, are similarly described in Zend and Pehlevi works. Unluckily, I have not, at present, the means of consulting Anquetil du Perron; or some other analogies might be traced. But there can be no doubt that another term which occurs in the Sanskrit text is identifiable in the Zend, and that the *Varsma* or *Varsama* of the Bhavishya Puráńa is the *Barsam* or *Barsom* of the Vendidád,—a bundle of twigs of the pomegranate, in place of the bundle of sacred grass used by the Brahmans, and equally an essential part of the apparatus employed in the worship of Fire, or oblations offered to that element, in both religions.

"It is evident, therefore, that the Bhavishya Puráńa, in the legend of Sámba, has in view the introduction of the fire-worship of Iran; and it is curious to find so prompt an adoption by the Brahmans, and such a cordial tolerance of a foreign system of religious practices and belief. The only question that suggests itself concerns the period at which this took place, the time at which the Brahmans acknowledged the high-priests of the Sun as little inferior, in sanctity, to their own order;—whether it followed the flight of the Parsees to Gujerat, in the beginning of the eighth century, or whether it occurred some few centuries earlier, when, we have reason to infer from numismatic evidence, Persian princes or satraps exercised authority on the north-west frontier of India. Either period would not be incompatible with the probable date of the Bhavishya Puráńa, which, in its actual form, cannot pretend to very remote antiquity. That the legend is of the more recent era is most likely; and this is confirmed by the circumstance of Sámba's being fabled to have gone from Dwáraká, in Gujerat, to bring the Magas from their native country to India. That the Parsees ever made

their way into the Punjab is very questionable; and no traces are recorded of their presence on the banks of the Chandrabhágá; nor have we any notice of the remains of a temple of the Sun in that quarter, although, according to Colonel Wilford, there was a city of Śámba in the same direction."

Instead of "Nishkumbhá", the preferable reading of MSS. seems to be Nikshubbá. Nor is Ṙijwáhwa called by a second name, "Ṙiju". For the castes in Śáka-dwípa, see Vol. II., pp. 199, 200. It will there be learned, from one of my annotations, that, in lieu of "Mṙiga",—the only reading known to Professor Wilson,—I found, in most of my copies, the undoubtedly correct 'Maga'.

P. LXV., l. 3. *Read* Yudhishṫhira.

P. LXXXVI., l. 18. See, for Hayagríva, Vol. V., p. 2, notes 1 and ¶.

P. XC., l. 12. *For* Kámákshyá *read* Kámákhyá. And see Vol. V., p. 88, notes 2 and ***.

P. XCIX., l. 22. *Read* beliefs.

P. CXV., l. 1. I have corrected Professor Wilson's "Ratnagarbha Bhaṫṫa". *Bhaṫṫáchárya* is a title which has been used, I believe, only in Lower Bengal; whereas the title of *Bhaṫṫa*, there unknown, seems to have been current in almost every other part of India.

P. CXV., l. 3 *ab infra*. Instead of 'Chitsukha Yogin', Professor Wilson had, erroneously, "Chit-sukha-yoni."

For Chitsukha Muni, perhaps the same as Chitsukha Yogin, see my Sanskrit Catalogue, pp. 155 and 206.

P. 2, l. 2. One of my MSS. here interpolates the following stanzas:

विश्वेश्वरं विश्वसृजं वरेण्यं
विश्वं विशुद्धं वरदं वरिष्ठम् ।
अनादिमध्यान्तमलक्ष्यरूपं
विष्णुं विभुं विप्रहितं नतोऽस्मि ॥
उत्पत्तिस्थितिसंहारमोक्षाणां चैककारणम् ।
नारायणमणीयांसं प्रणतोऽस्मि जगद्गुरुम् ॥

P. 6, l. 7. Instead of the five stanzas which, according to the text followed by the Translator, begin the work, three of my best MSS. give only the last of them, preceded by the following:

श्रीश्रीनिधानं गुणरत्नराजितं
पराशरं ब्रह्मसुधाम्बुधिं भजे ।
हृद्यो हरेर्विष्णुपुराणकौस्तुभो
यस्मादभूद्व्यासविभुस्स विश्वदृक् ॥

P 6, l. 16. "All the Hindu systems consider vegetable bodies as endowed with life." So, and correctly, remarks Professor Wilson, in his collected Works, Vol. III., p. 381. *Charáchara*, or the synonymous *sthávara* and *jangama*, is, therefore, inaccurately rendered, in pp. 6, 47, 64, 149, 183, and elsewhere, "animate and inanimate", "sentient beings" and "unconscious", "conscious and unconscious beings", &c. &c. 'Loco-

motive and fixed' would be better, since trees are considered to possess souls.

P. 8, note †. See Vol. III., p. 35, note ‡.

P. 32, notes, l. 14 *ab infra. Read* Swayaṁbhú.

P. 46, ll. 1, 2. The original is:

उत्पन्नः प्रोच्यते विद्वन्नित्य एवोपचारतः ।

The term उपचारतः here implies 'metaphorically'.

P. 55, notes, l. 5. *Read* Swayaṁbhú.

P. 60, notes, l. 2 *ab infra.* Read *Sthúlamaya.*

P. 65, note *. Also see *Original Sanskrit Texts,* Part I., pp. 50, 51 (2nd ed.).

P. 66, notes, ll. 3—5 *ab infra.* Dr. Muir translates, more correctly: "Every substance (*vastu*) is brought into the state of substance (*vastutá*) by its own inherent power." *Original Sanskrit Texts,* Part. I., p. 51 (2nd ed.).

P. 70, notes, l. 7 *ab infra.* For the term *mukhya,* see *Original Sanskrit Texts,* Part I., p. 57, text and note 104 (2nd ed.).

P. 80, note, l. 7 *ab infra.* For the term *ambháṁsi,* see *Original Sanskrit Texts,* Part I., p. 24, note 36 (2nd ed.).

P. 84, ll. 13 *et seq.* For a similar passage, translated from the *Taittiríya-saṁhitá,* see *Original Sanskrit Texts,* Part I., p. 16 (2nd ed.).

P. 85, notes, l. 11. Instead of 'Shoḋaśin', the Translator had "Sorasi". Many errors of this stamp have been corrected silently.

P. 95, l. 7. Professor Wilson had "Gaveduká", instead of 'Gavedhuká'; for which see Vol. V., p. 175, notes 3 and ||.

P. 95, notes, l. 10. The *udára* is a wild grain, according to the commentators.

P. 95, notes, l. 11. For the Professor's "Kodrava", I have put 'Koradúsha'. On this word the commentator Śrídhara makes a remark which plainly evinces that he was not an inhabitant of Eastern India.

P. 96, l. 10. Where I have printed 'drop', the first edition had "dross". The error was typographical, the original word being *bindu.*

P. 98, notes, l. 4. "The city of the Gandharvas is, properly, Alaká,—on Mount Meru,—the capital of Kubera." Professor Wilson, in Professor Johnson's *Selections from the Mahábhárata,* p. 11.

P. 108, l. 1. For the origin of the name Uttánapáda, see *Original Sanskrit Texts,* Part I., p. 72 (2nd ed.).

P. 109, l. 4. Daksha's daughters by Prasúti furnish several of the Mátṛis, according to divers enumerations of the members of this group.

P. 111, notes, l. 11. It is observable that we here have Daṅḋanaya, but Daṅḋa and Naya in p. 110.

P. 112, text and note *. Raurava is one hell, and Naraka is another. See Vol. II., p. 214; p. 215, note ||; and p. 216.

P. 114, l. 13. The words "whose essence is the elements" scarcely render aright the original expression, *bhúta-bhávana.*

P. 116, ll. 4, 5. In Áswaláyana's *Gṛihya-sútra,* IV., VIII., 19, we find the following names: Hara, Mṛiḋa, Śarva, Śiva, Bhava, Mahádeva, Ugra, Bhíma, Paśupati, Rudra, Śankara, Íśána.

P. 117, l. 2. *For* Ushá *read* Ushas. The latter is classical; the former, Vaidik. Compare *apsará* and *apsaras*.

P. 117, l. 7 and note ‡. According to the *Mahábhárata*, *Ádi-parvan*, *śl.* 2589, Anila had two sons, Manojava and Avijnátagati. Which of the two is the same as Hanumat is undecided. Can Anila be synonymous with Íśána? If not, there are two Manojavas with mothers of the same name, Śivá.

P. 119, l. 10. Instead of Gaurí, some MSS. yield Bhútigaurí.

P. 119, ll. 23, 24. Dhaneśwara is the term there rendered "the god of riches"; and Kubera is not named in the original.

P. 129, l. 9. Instead of my 'Sumeru', the former edition had "Meru", which I find in no MS.

P. 139, l. 21. उपचारतः—a word often misapprehended by the Translator,—here means 'metaphorically', not "who is not in need of assistance". Further, परमेशः, rendered "the supreme god", is explained as meaning 'lord of the great Má', *i. e.*, Lakshmí. The original of the sentence is as follows:

प्रोच्यते परमेशो हि यः शुद्धोऽप्युपचारतः ।
प्रसीदतु स नो विष्णुरात्मा यः सर्वदेहिनाम् ॥

"May he who, though pure *of connexion with all things*, is, by a figure of speech, called lord of the great Má", &c.

P. 144, note *. My list of corrigenda, entirely overlooked by Professor Müller, points out several gross typographical errors; and these he has reproduced.

P. 147, note, last line. Ordinarily, at least, Ráhu is described as a Dánava, or son of Danu.

P. 148, notes, l. 7. Ráhu is generally considered to be the ascending node; Ketu, the descending.

P. 152, l. 4. Besides this Lakshmí, the text of the *Vishńu-puráńa* mentions another, of less note, daughter of Daksha, and wife of Dharma. See the Index..

P. 152, l. 7. The first edition had, for Niyati, Niryati,—an error of the press.

P. 154, notes, l. 14 *ab infra*. "Agastya is a celebrated person in Hindu legend. He is fabled to have prostrated the Vindhya mountain, as well as to have drunk the ocean dry. The traditions of the South of India ascribe to him a principal share in the formation of the Tamil language and literature; and the general tenour of the legends relating to him denotes his having been instrumental in the introduction of the Hindu religion and civilization into the Peninsula." Professor Wilson, in Professor Johnson's *Selections from the Mahábhárata*, p. 51, note 2.

P. 155, l. 7. *Read* Abhimánin.

P. 155, notes, l. 7. *Read* Śankhapád. See Vol. II., p. 262, note †, *ad finem*.

P. 156, notes, l. 5. Pávaka, I think, is called parent of Kavyaváhana.

P. 156, note 2. See Vol. III., p. 166, note *.

P. 159, note, l. 3. Instead of 'Áyushmat', the former edition had "Ayushmanta", which is impossible.

P. 165, l. 5. The word "Madhuvana" is not in the original.

P. 177, l. 2. Variants of Ślishťi are Śrishťi and Śishťi.

P. 177, l. 8. Arańya seems to be as common a reading as Anarańya.

P. 177, l. 9. For the patriarch Vairája, see Vol. II., p. 86.

P. 178, l. 1. The original here not only names Ṕithu, but calls him by his patronym, Vainya.

P. 178, notes, l. 12. The unwarrantable "Suvíthi" stood, in the former edition, for my 'Swarvíthi'.

P. 182, notes, l. 10 *Read* Bhramaras.

Pp. 187—191. For a passage on the milking of the Earth, see the *Atharva-veda*, VIII., X., 22-29,—especially, 24. I have to thank Dr. Muir for this reference.

P. 194, l. 2. It would have been an improvement, for clearness, to put Samudra, instead of "ocean". Ságara, a well-known proper name, also means "ocean".

VOL. II.

P. 5, last line. The original word for "region" is *áyatana.*

P. 7, ll. 3 and 19. *Read* Keśava.

P. 9, notes, l. 8 *ab infra.* *Read* by.

P. 21, notes, l. 2. Professor Wilson had "Kakud" where I have substituted 'Kakubh'.

P. 22, l. 3. For definitions of the Vasus and Rudras, see the *Ṕihad-árańyaka Upanishad*, III., IX., 3, 4.

P. 29, l. 3. On the number of the gods, see the *Ṕihad-árańyaka Upanishad*, III., IX., 1, 2

P. 29, notes, l. 5. *Read* Śastradevatás.

P. 71, l. 6. Siṁhiká was half-sister of Viprachitti.

P. 85, ll. 4, 5. Soma, here called monarch of Bráhmans, was, himself, a Kshattra, according to the *Ṕihad-árańyaka Upanishad*, I., IV., 11.

P. 86, l. 5. For Vairája, see Vol. III., p. 158, note ‡.

P. 100, l. 3. The Translator had "Medha" where I have put 'Medhas'.

P. 105, notes, ll. 5, 6. Arhat is synonymous with Jina; Árhata, with Jaina. See Vol. V., p. 376, note †.

P. 112, note, l. 14. Instead of Kubera, we have Soma, in p. 240.

P. 117, l. 8. The Gandhamádana mentioned in p. 122 is a different mountain.

P. 120, l. 3. Burnouf considers the Śítá to be the same as the Sihoun. *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*, Vol. I., p. 540.

P. 120, note ‡. The Sanskrit name of the Oxus seems, through the Chinese, to be Vakshu. And this form I have found, more than once, in MSS.

P. 121, notes, l. 10 *ab infra.* *Read* Śarayu.

P. 128, notes, l. 7. *Read* Narmadá.

P. 137, notes, l. 10. *Read* मनुष्या.

P. 143, notes, l. 12 *ab infra.* Professor Wilson had "Sthánešwara" where I have put 'Sthańwiśwara'. This, the correct form, I learned from

the *Harsha-charita.* The first word in the compound is Sthánu, a name of Śiva.

P. 149, l. 1. According to Mr. Molesworth's Maráthí Dictionary, a river Pravará falls into the Godávarí at Ṭonken.

P. 152, l. 1. *Read* Púrńáśá.

P. 155, notes, l. 13 *ab infra.* *Read* 131.

P. 159, notes, l. 10. *Read* Kuńḍina.

P. 163, notes, last line. *For* Káśí *read* of the Káśis.

P. 166, note *. *For* third *read* fourth.

P. 166, note ††. The Máhishikí river is named in the Bengal recension of the *Rámáyańa, Kishkindhá-káńḍa,* XLI., 16.

P. 166. Erase note §§.

P. 172, notes, l. 6. *Read* occur.

P. 172, note ‡‡. For Kuśasthalí and Kuśávatí, see Vol. III., p. 320, note ‖.

P. 174, note 1. "The Sauvíras, although applied here to a particular family, denote, as is subsequently shown, a tribe or people either identical, or closely connected, with the Sindhus; for Jayadratha is indifferently termed Raja of the Sindhus or Saindhavas and Raja of the Sauvíras. They are sometimes named in concert, as Sindhu-sauvíras, and, whether the same as the dwellers on the Indus, or a kindred tribe, must have occupied much the same territory,—the western and southern portion of the Punjab." Professor Wilson, in Professor Johnson's *Selections from the Mahábhárata,* p. 65, note 3.

P. 177, note 1. For the supposed modern representatives of the Dahae, see Sir H. M. Elliot's *Supplemental Glossary,* pp. 414, 415.

P. 178, l. 2. *Read* Karńáṫakas.

P. 211, notes, l. 5. *Read* Puloman.

P. 221, text and note 1. According to Sir David Lyndesay's less pagan notions,—which he shared with S. Thomas Aquinas and Peter Lombard,—a humbler class than the gods, the elect, will be indulged with the felicity of contemplating the discomforts of the damned:

> "Thay sall reioyis to se the gret dolour
> Off dampnit folk in hell, and thare torment;
> Because of God it is the iuste iugement."

P. 236, ll. 10, 11. Compare the *Bhagavad-gítá,* IX., 16.

P. 255, notes, l. 7. *For* 1809 *read* 2010, in correction of Professor Wilson.

P. 287, note *. For Rambha, see Vol V., p. 12, text and note ‖.

P. 288, note †. For Ápúrańa, see Vol. V., p. 251, note †.

P. 293, notes, l. 12 *ab infra.* *Read* Śakra.

P. 316, note 1. It does not appear that the *Bhágavata-puráńa* mentions Jambúmárga. Probably it is named by the scholiast Śrídhara: for Professor Wilson not seldom confounds commentary and text.

P. 318, l. 4. A Sauvíra is an inhabitant of Suvíra. Read, therefore, 'king of the Sauvíras'.

P. 340, l. 32. *Read* l. 11 *ab infra.*

P. 341, l. 25. Mahárásh̤ṫra, it seems, was a designation known to Hiouen Thsang.

P. 343, ll. 21—23. Erase the note.

VOL. III.

P. 2, notes, l. 4. *Read* Yámas.

P. 6, notes, l. 18. *Read* Vaṁśavartins.

P. 7, notes, l. 2. The inverted commas should come at the end of the sentence in the line preceding.

P. 16, l. 1. *Read* Ákúti.

P. 18, notes, l. 3. *Read* Vaikuńt́ha.

P. 44, notes, l. 5. *Read* Śánti.

P. 55, note †. For the meaning of *prńáyáma*, see Vol. V., p. 231, note ||.

P. 60, l. 6. Kŕita seems to be the right name. See Vol. IV., p. 143, text and note †.

P. 77, note 1. Compare Vol. V., pp. 229, 230, text and annotations.

P. 80, notes, l. 2 *ab infra*. *For* father *read* grandfather.

P. 87, note ‡. *For* p. 110, note §, *read* p. 113, note †, and p. 114, notes ‡ and §.

P. 131, notes, l. 8 *ab infra*. The real designation of the work there named is, I find, *Práńakŕishńiyaśabdábdhi*.

P. 131, notes, l. 14. Tárachandra Chakravartin prepared the revised English translation; and the Bengalee translation was the work of Viśwanátha Tarkabhúshańa. See the London *Asiatic Journal*, 1832, Part I., p. 335.

P. 164, note †. See p. 221, note ||, in the same volume.

P. 167, notes, l. 13. *Read* Váruńa.

P. 179, notes, l. 10 *ab infra*. *Read* I., LXXXIX., 3.

P. 183, note †. *For* Vol. II. *read* Vol. I.

P. 187, notes, l. 8 *ab infra*. Read *Brahmáńd́a-puráńa*.

P. 197, l. 4. The Manu intended is Vaivaswata; for whom see p. 13 of the same volume.

P. 198, notes, l. 9. *Read* vague sense.

P. 209, l. 1. *Read* Árhatas.

P. 209, note 2. Professor Wilson should have written 'Árhata'. See Vol. V., p. 376, note †.

P. 217, note *. Read *Ŕishi*.

P. 218, l. 9. Instead of "Raja of Káśí" the correct rendering is 'Raja of the Káśis'.

P. 220, l. 3 *ab infra*. The translation is not literal here, and yields neither "king of Káśí" nor 'king of the Káśis'.

P. 230, note ||. See p. 20, note 1, in the same volume.

P. 245, l. 5. *Read* Tŕińabindu.

P. 249, notes, l. 3. It is meant that Ánarta and the rest were brothers.

P. 249, note ¶. *Read* IX.

P. 266, notes, l. 4. *Read* Rantinára. Also see Vol. IV., p. 129.

P. 266, notes, l. 8. *Read* Matinára. Also see Vol. IV., p. 129, notes 2 and ||.

P. 267, l. 21. The learned reader may be amused by the whimsical etymologies, of a like character to this, given in the annexed stanza

from Appayya Díkshita's *Śivatattwaviveka*:

हिसिधातोः सिंहशब्दो वश कान्तौ शिवः स्मृतः ।
वर्णव्यत्ययतः शब्दः पश्य कः काश्यपो यथा ॥

P. 280, note *. Yauvanáśwa is, of course, the patronym of Ambarísha.

P. 283, notes, l. 2. 'Duh́saha' is a more ordinary form than "Dussaha".

P. 321, notes, l. 5. *Read* Tárápíd́a.

P 325, notes, l. 2. For a Yájnavalkya, in connexion with the Yoga philosophy, see Vol. V., p. 230, note ‖.

P. 325, note 4. Viśwasáhwan is, probably, one with the Viśwasaha of p. 323.

P. 330, notes, l. 2. See Vol. IV., p. 344; supplementary annotation on p. 84.

P. 334, l. 1. *Read* Ŕitujit.

P. 336, note §. *For* 353 *read* pp. 244, 245.

VOL. IV.

P. 17, note 1. For Ŕichíka, see Vol. III., p. 80, note †.

P. 30, l. 6. Compare p. 136, note 1, in the same volume.

P. 40, note ‡. Compare what is said of Tálajangha in p. 57.

P. 57, l. 3. *Read* Tálajanghas.

P. 63, notes, l. 13. *Read* Ruchaka.

P. 67, notes, l. 6. *Read* Romapáda.

P. 95, l. 3. *Read* Áváha.

P. 97, note ‡. *Read* Dh́rish́t́a.

P. 100, notes, l. 18. *Read* Śúra.

P. 111, notes, l. 3 *ab infra*. *Read* Haḿsa, Suvaḿśa.

P. 112, note ‖. For Cháruhásiní, see Vol. V., p. 69, note §; p. 81, note §; and p. 83, note §.

P. 114, notes, l. 10 *ab infra*. *Read* p. 98.

P. 123, notes, l. 10. Insert a comma after "Bŕihaspati".

P. 129, note ‖. *Erase* another, Atitára.

P. 132, notes, l. 12 *ab infra*. It is observable that, in p. 102, we have had a Bhíma son of Anila.

P 141, notes, l. 4. *Read* Dŕidháśwa.

P. 142, note ††. *For* Dhŕitarásht́ra *read* Dhŕitarásht́ra's charioteer, according to the more usual legend.

P. 144, note 3. *Read* Ŕiksha.

P. 148, notes, l. 6. *Read* Arimejaya.

P. 157. Erase note §.

P. 171, note 1. For Śreńika, father of Kúnika, see the *Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society*, Vol IX., p. 154.

P. 178, l. 5 and note ‖. For "Chandapradyota" and his son Pálaka, see the *Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society*, Vol. IX., p. 147.

P. 182, note **. *Read* is Udayin. For Udáyin, said to have been son of Kúnika, see the *Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society*, Vol. IX., pp. 147, 154.

P. 184, note 2. A *mahápadma* is only a thousand millions, according to the *Lilávati*. Elsewhere a simple *padma* is said to be ten thousand millions. See Vol. V., p. 187, note †, and p. 188, note ||.

P. 202, l. 1. For Gardabhila, said to have been king of Ujjayini, and father of Vikramáditya, see the *Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society*, Vol. IX., pp. 139, 143, 148, 154.

P. 215, note *. For Pushpamitra, see the *Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society*, Vol. IX., p. 148.

P. 216, l. 1, and p. 217, notes, l. 1. For Viśwasphaťika, see the *Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society*, Vol. IX., p. 146.

P. 217, note ‡. *For* Kantipuri *read* Kántipuri.

P. 223, notes, l. 11 *ab infra*. *Read* Chandrabhágá.

P. 248, ll. 7, 8. "The increaser of the Bhojas" would be the correct rendering. See p. 260, note ¶, in the same volume.

P. 279. Erase note ‡.

P. 308, note 1. See Vol. V., p. 231, notes 1 and ||.

VOL. V.

P. 2, note ¶. For Hayagriva, as slain by Vishńu, see p. 90.

P. 2, notes, l. 7 *ab infra*. *Read* बभूवुरश्वशतीः.

P. 26, notes, l. 12 *ab infra*. *Read* निष्क्रम्य.

P. 53, notes, l. 9. Read *Harivaṁśa.*

P. 74, notes, l. 5. Read *Gaja-gámini.*

P. 140, notes, l. 6. Read *Viráťa-parvan.*

P. 169, notes, l. 3 *ab infra*. Read *Vaṁśánucharita.*

P. 176, l. 6. *For* sage *read* age.

P. 190, notes. l. 4. By the ori inal expression, here rendered "four fingers", 'four finger-breadths' is intended.

P. 209, notes, l. 3. *Read* Tat-práptaye.

P. 250, l. 4. *Read* Ŕishi.

P. 250, l. 5. *Read* Ŕibhu.

P. 290, notes, l. 5. *Read* Vámácharins.

P. 319, l. 5. Read *Brahmáńda.*

P. 326, l. 1. "Váma Yamácharin", it may be surmised, is a typographical error for 'Vámácharin'.

P. 356, l. 4 *ab infra* *Read* Madhwácharya.

P. 358, l. 5. Read *Sri Bhágavata.*

POSTSCRIPT.

The MSS. of the *Vishńu-puráńa* and of its commentaries used by the Editor belong, chiefly, to himself, and are the best, or copies of the best, which he was able to discover during a long and extensive search in India. He has also carefully examined all the oldest and most valuable MSS. which he knows to exist in England, and an especially excellent one obligingly lent to him by the accomplished Principal of the Benares College, Mr. Griffith. The Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta impressions he has, further, constantly had by his side; and he has frequently consulted them, but to little useful purpose. With few exceptions, the Sanskrit works brought out under the supervision of Hindus are inferior even to indifferent manuscripts; and this must continue to be their character, so long as they betray a systematic disregard of the most elementary principles of editorial probity.

As regards the original and the translation of a book, until the text of the first is duly ascertained, the other can be worth very little; and the MSS. of the *Vishńu-puráńa*—which is still inedited,—present a choice of lections in almost every line. Professor Wilson sometimes employed one MS., sometimes another; and there are but rare indications that he compared together even two, out of all that were accessible to him. The consequence of impatience of collation is inevitable; and it not seldom happens that he unfortunately had before him, and followed, the very worst reading from among a variety of good and bad.

Had the Editor clearly foreseen, in time, what awaited him, rather than do that which he has done, he would have hazarded a critical edition of the *Vishńu-puráńa* in the original, and an entirely new translation. The one has long been all but ready for the press; but its appearance has been defeated by one manœuvre after another, and now can never be realized. An independent version of his own would, certainly, have cost him

much less trouble than the invidious labour which he has expended on these volumes. Of notes he would have been sparing; inasmuch as, in the whole compass of Sanskrit literature, he could not consider the text of even a dozen works to be sufficiently settled to warrant an appeal to them, except in a most general way, for purposes of comparison or illustration.

Though many of Professor Wilson's notes have no very intimate connexion with his translation, others have such a connexion; and some of them are necessary to its very intelligibility. To make a selection, from among these categories, as subject-matter for remark, would have been difficult, and, the question of difficulty apart, would have been liable to objection. Emendations, to be rendered at all convincing, every here and there demanded the production of new matter; and, sometimes, when such matter has lain at the Editor's elbow, it has been offered to the reader, notwithstanding its being only indirectly germane to the occasion. As for his annotations, however, he does not lay the least claim to their being exhaustive. He has given mere specimens,—at best, suggestive of the peril which, in the dawn of the exploration of Sanskrit literature, attends on peremptory statement or positiveness of conclusion,—and equally so where he has amended the Professor's renderings, and, in short, in the discharge of his revisory functions generally. Still, in one important respect he has been solicitous of thoroughness. By citations from, and references to, the other publications of Professor Wilson, he has studied—not unsuccessfully, he trusts,—to make him, as far as possible, his own commentator, corrector, and supplementer.

A copious disquisition on the Puráńas as a class, and on the *Vishńu-puráńa* in particular, is reserved against the emergence of some other opportunity for publishing it.

The sixth volume will be occupied with a full index to the entire work.

LONDON,
July, 1869.

Printed by Unger Brothers (Th. Grimm), Berlin, Friedrichsstrasse 24.